SANSKRIT PUSTAK BHANDAR
38, Bidhan Sarani, Kolkata-6
Phone : (033) 2241 1208
sanskritpustakbhandar@gmail.com
www.sanskritpustakbhandar.com

ISBN : 978-93-87800-32-8

VIDŪṢAKA : BHĀSA AND KĀLIDĀSA A COMPARATIVE STUDY SEBANTI SINHA

VIDŪṢAKA : BHĀSA AND KĀLIDĀSA
A COMPARATIVE STUDY

SEBANTI SINHA

VIDŪṢAKA : BHĀSA AND KĀLIDĀSA - A COMPARATIVE STUDY

SEBANTI SINHA
M.A. M. PHIL, UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

SANSKRIT PUSTAK BHANDAR
KOLKATA

Published By :
Shri Debasish Bhattacharya
Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar
38, Bidhan Sarani
Kolkata-6

First Published : June, 2018

© Reserved

ISBN : 978-93-87800-32-8

Price : 300.00

Printed By :
Abhinaba Mudrani
Kolkata-6

CONTENTS

		Page No.
1.	Introduction	11
2.	Bhāsa's treatment of the Characters of Vidūṣaka	23
3.	Comparison of the characters of the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa with each other	47
4.	Kālidāsa's treatment of the characters of Vidūṣakas	59
5.	Comparison of the characters of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa with each other	95
6.	Comparison of the characters of the Vidūṣakas observed by Bhāsa and Kālidāsa	103
7.	Evaluation	117
8.	Bibliography	119

Preface

सरस्वति नमस्तुभ्यं वरदे कामरुपिणि ।
विद्यारभं करिष्यामि सिद्धिर्भवतु मे सदा ॥

Hymning the eternal Mother Saraswatī – the Goddess of learning with the amaranth of above holy stotra composed by the great sage Agastya and begging the blessings of her blessed child – the immortal great poet Kālidāsa who roams in the firmament of Sanskrit literature like the ever glowing brilliant Sun with his loving offspring Mādhavya who twinkles constantly on the infinite sky of literature being visible sometimes and sometimes invisible yet delighting the whole universe day in and day out whether visible or not, I, the most tiny devotee of Sanskrit literature and obviously of the great poets like Bhāsa and Kālidāsa, ventured to write something regarding the comparative study of the Vidūṣakas created by them and in doing so I happened to express some pungent remarks about the opinions of some eminent critics about them for which my heart shivers in utter fear whether those eminent critics would chase me with their blood shot eyes for this feat of mine. Even Jayadeva, the great devotee of Lord Kṛṣṇa dared not to jot down the famous line – 'Dehi padapallavamudāram' in his immortal poetic composition 'Gītagovindam' and it is Lord Kṛṣṇa who Himself being affectionate enough set His sacred Lotus Feet in his house and wrote the holy line with his own hand in his book of verse. I myself knowingly or unknowingly expressed remarks for which I seek mercy of the great lovers of Sanskrit literature if this venture is not worthy of mine.

Of all the Sanskrit dramas which I have gone through till now, I am infatuated with Kālidasa's Abhijñānaśakuntalam most. To me Abhijñānaśakuntalam is the bliss of Kālidāsa's heart's paradise. In this paper I have tried my best to justify my arguments with as many logic and reasoning as I could. Still I do believe that a good many points remained untouched or less discussed, which, if I could cover would beyond doubt enrich this small effort of mine to a large extent. However, I cherish the desire in my mind to work on the subject widely in future if I become fortunate enough to get the chance. I shall be ever grateful and shall think that my tiny attempt of encroaching upon this field where a good many eminent scholars of profound wisdom set their feet is crowned with ample success if it gets a little appreciation of my revered predecessors in this field.

Here I owe my indebtedness to the eminent critics like A. B. Keith, Dr. G. K. Bhāt, Dr. J. T. Pārikh, Dr. Gāyatri Verma. A. D. Pusalkar, Shri Dilip Kumār Kāñjilāl and many others whose priceless writings have purveyed courage to my heart by providing important points regarding this field. I am thankful to the library of my University of Calcutta, National Library, Kolkata, The Asiatic Society, West Bengal, and Sanskrit Sāhitya Parisad from where I could freely and fairly collect books for plucking precious materials to adorn this paper. I am grateful to my eminent teachers of the University of Calcutta whose constant and precious inspiration boosted me to tread in this field. At length I convey my heartiest indebtedness to my revered preceptor and guide Professor Dr. Gopālchandra Mishra, who adorned the dignified chair of the Vice Chancellor of Gourbanga University, Māldā, West Bengal, without whose vigil, proper and invaluable guidance my attempt would be a futile quest for will – o' - the - wisp .

VIDŪṢAKA : BHĀSA AND KĀLIDĀSA - A COMPARATIVE STUDY

1. Introduction

Humour, starting from the early ages down to the modern times, is inherent characteristic of human society. According to Thomas Wright "A tendency to burlesque and caricature….. is one of the earliest talents displayed by people in a rude state of society. An appreciation of sensitiveness to ridicule, and a love of that which is humorous, are found even among savages….In fact art itself, in its earliest forms, is caricature; for it is only by that exaggeration of features which belongs to caricature that unskilled draughtsmen could make themselves understand." In fact comedy i.e. Hāsya Rasa is an essential part of our life. It has a great biological value. It is an aromatic spice of life. It acts like a pinch of keśar i.e. saffron in a cup of milk. In absence of humour life becomes insipid, dull and monotonous and it is humour that turns life to an enjoyable state. In the literature of almost all languages of the world we find presence of humour. In dramatic performances when the situation becomes highly tensed, the presentation of comedy gives a comic relief to the situation making the drama more enjoyable.

In fact literature is rightly called the mirror of life which is an excellent blend of different feelings like happiness, anger, misery, grief, humour and so on. As literature reflects life, these invariably creep into it and as drama is an important branch of literature, it obviously occupies its place in dramatic performances through its dramatis personae.

In Sanskrit drama, comedy is presented by the dramatist through a stock character called Vidūṣaka. The first and foremost function of the Vidūṣaka is to amuse the audience with his queer dress, peculiar mode of talking, activity and deformity of body. His

another function is to help the hero to achieve his mission in love and accompanying the hero always to alleviate his mental stress when the hero becomes morose and hopeless about his success in achieving his mission of love. He is to act as Śṛngāra Rasa Sahāya to the erotic Hero. Vidūṣakas create laughter on the stage with the help of 'vulgar talks, irrelevant remarks and abusive words' and Bharata terms it as Kāvyaja Hāsya. Vidūṣakas are also termed as Vikṛtavāk which primarily means 'abusive speech'. Śāradatanaya describes the Vidūṣaka as 'aślīlavāk'.

Vidūṣaka is recognised as an important character in dramatic performances. In his Nāṭyaśāstra, Bharata, the foremost dramaturge, recognized Vidūṣaka as one of the five main actors of the theatrical performances and placed him at the head of the principal actors viz. Vidūṣaka , Tauripa, Nāndī, Sūtradhāra and others. According to Śāradatanya Vidūṣaka is one of the major actors viz. the Sūtradhāra, the Naṭa, the Naṭī and the assistant who along with the Vidūṣaka perform the stage-play. Abhinavagupta, the author of Abhinavabhāratī, a commentary on Bharat's Nāṭyaśāstra, recognized him as one of the two assistants of Sūtradhāra.

However, before entering deep into the analysis of the characteristics of Vidūṣaka, a small venture of finding out the origin of the Vidūṣaka would be a right approach. From Bharata we can get a clear conception about the origin of the drama but he focused no light on the origin of the Vidūṣaka. "He simply assumes the Vidūṣaka to be a necessary character in a dramatic representation and without suggesting the probable origin and growth of this character, proceeds to explain his characteristics and functions on the stage."[1] In Western

---

G. K.Bhat : The Vidūṣaka

literature also we find existence of the fool. But there is a sharp difference between the Vidūṣaka, the fool of Sanskrit drama and Western fool in respect of their origin. In the latter case there is adequate availability of sources from where a conclusion can be arrived at about the origin of its Fools. But in Sanskrit literature this side is absolutely dark. There are some critics who claim foreign influence on Sanskrit drama and consequently on the root and origin of the Vidūṣaka. Windisch thinks that Sanskrit drama has some Greek influence in it. He holds the opinion that the Vidūṣaka originated from the figure of servus currens of Greek drama. Reich and E. Muller-Ḥess are inclined to stress on the point that the Roman Mime had definite influence on the Vidūṣaka.

But present critics do not see eye to eye with them. Now it is clearly established that the Sanskrit drama bears a far older and independent origin. The works of Pāṇini, Patañjali, Bhāsa, the Buddhist dramas etc. amply corroborate this claim. So it may not be unjustified to presume that the Vidūṣakas owe its origin in the real life of India. Pischel is of the opinion that "the puppet play, which probably originated in India only, is the source of Sanskrit Drama and it is also the origin of the Vidūṣaka."

M. Schuyler is of the opinion that the Vidūṣaka originated in the plays of the early tribes of India. According to his language, "The Vidūṣaka originated not in the court drama under the influence of the Brāhmaṇa caste, but in the earlier plays of the different tribes of India. These primitive efforts are presumed to have been for the most part farces, their characters were doubtless taken from the actual life of that time. It was in this way that the priest-ridden people had an opportunity to express their hatred of the Brāhmaṇas which, no doubt,

they eagerly embraced. By making the Vidūṣaka a degraded and contemptible wretch, who was nevertheless a Brāhmaṇa, they could give a farcical element to their rude and formless plays and at the same time take revenge on the privileged class." Levi holds the opinion that the Vidūṣaka owes its origin from the 'type of Brāhmaṇa who serves as go-between in love affairs, masking his degraded trade under the cloak of religion' of Prākṛta drama which is considered to be the predecessor of Sanskrit drama.

So although there are differences of opinion about the origin of Vidūṣaka, there are ample reasons to come to the conclusion that the Vidūṣakas had an indigenous origin and as art and literature do not succumb to the barriers of the geographical boundaries of the countries and spread their all pervading essence in all directions, the foreign Greek and Roman dramas might have instilled some influences on the growth and development of the character of Vidūṣaka subsequently.

Many Western Scholars hold the opinion that the Sanskrit drama bears a religious origin. One of them is Keith who "seeks the origin of the Sanskrit drama in Vedic ritual, where he discovers the origin of Vidūṣaka too."[2] Besides, Keith drew analogy between the Vidūṣaka and the Brahmin of the Mahābhārata in the *Soma* sale. Lindenau is inclined to draw resemblance between the Vidūṣaka and Vṛṣākapi of Ṛgveda.

There are differences of opinion about whether the origin of Vidūṣaka is religious although it is recognized that Sanskrit drama bears a religious origin. According to Keith "the popular origin of

2. ibid

Vidūṣaka is obvious, but the point is whether this origin is religious or secular" although Keith does not recognize the secular origin of Vidūṣaka. So, as G. K. Bhāt said, it may be accepted that "if a formal origin is to be discovered for the Vidūṣaka it must be sought, according to the evidence of the Nāṭyaśāstra, in the figure of the Asura, who must have been represented both as a hideous and as a comic character. It is in this sense that the Vidūṣakas may be said to have a popular and religious origin."

But whatever the fact may be, till now the fact regarding the actual source and origin of the character of Vidūṣaka is overcast with darkness and conclusion arrived at by different scholars are based on speculations only and it requires the involvement of more scholars in this field to conduct research to detect the reality although it is doubtful how far the progress may be because of the dearth of proper materials and documents.

'Vi- duṣ-ñi-ghe-ṇak' is the derivative form of the word Vidūṣaka. The very presence of the root 'duṣ' indicates degraded implication of the character of Vidūṣaka the jester, comedian, the buffoon, the droll, stupid, glutton- whatever he may be for the purpose of generating humour and laughter on the stage so as to relieve seriousness of the main 'Rasa'. The root 'duṣ' means 'spoil' or 'blame'. So Vidūṣaka acts as a 'spoiler of fun' which he does through his own characteristic comic manner. The meaning of the word Vidūṣaka has been described by Prof. Keith stating, "The name denotes him as given to abuse". According to Dr. A.N. Upādāhya, the word Vidūṣaka is a back-formation from 'Viūso', a Prākṛta form of 'Vidūṣa' which means learned. Bharata might have derived the word Vidūṣaka from *Vi* + *duṣ*. Some others are of the opinion that as the

Vidūṣakas would at any time point out the 'doṣa' i.e. the vices or shortcomings of the kings without any hesitation, the root 'duṣ' has specifically been applied to the term Vidūṣaka.

Bharata, the foremost dramaturge, defined Vidūṣaka as a degraded Brahmin of short height having ugly face with prominent teeth, bald head, tawny hair, reddish eyes and hunch- back and monkey-like appearance[3].

In short according to Bharata the Vidūṣaka is a ugly-looking character of theatrical performances. But the later dramaturges did not define him as so ugly. Only Śāradatanaya agreed with Bharata in this regard. His definition[4] of Vidūṣaka almost corresponds to that of Bharata.

According to Viśwanātha, the author of Sāhityadarpaṇa, the name of Vidūṣaka is to be given after the name of flower or season, he should have a queer dress and his function is to produce profuse fun for the audience with his strange behavior and physical deformity. He will at times indulge in fake quarrel with the hero and will be glutton by nature[5].

However, physical deformity is the most vital characteristic of the Vidūṣaka. He acts as the chief companion of hero, is a greedy person, possesses high fondness for food and is a stupid or fool by nature. His deformed figure, queer dress, foolish talks are the sources of Hāsya Rasa in Sanskrit drama.

3 वामनो दन्तुरः कुब्जो द्विजन्मा विकृताननः।
खलतिः पिङ्गलाक्षश्च स विज्ञेयो विदूषकः ॥ Kāvyamālā Series Nāṭyaśāstra 24-106

4 खलति पिङ्गलाक्षश्च हास्यनूकविभूषितः।
पिङ्गकेशो हरिण्मश्रुर्नर्तकश्च विदूषकः

5 कुसुमवसन्ताद्यभिधः कर्मवपुर्वेशभाषादेः।
हास्यकरः कलहरतिर्विदुषकः स्यात् स्वकर्म जः ॥ Sāhitya Darpan 6/51

Vidūṣaka carries in his hand a daṇḍakāṣṭha i.e. a wooden-stick called Kuṭilaka which is called so because it is not straight but crooked one, which, as prescribed by Bharata, is made of the branches of trees like Kapiththa or bilva or bamboo and it is curbed in one third of its length, should have three bents , should not be eaten by worms, should not be attacked by disease and should bear the mark which is called Lakṣaṇa and should not have many twigs.

From this the reader can easily imagine how humorous the appearance of the Vidūṣaka will be when he will appear on the stage with his dwarf figure, hunch back, bald head with tawny ugly face, with prominent teeth, with monkey mask accompanied by a crooked and queer- looking stick in his hand as described above. Besides, being an element of humour and amusement, Kuṭilaka bears a story behind it. There goes a mythological tale that when Bharata intended to present his first stage performance, he needed some stage materials and different gods supplied him the materials as gift and it is the God Brahmā who offered him this daṇḍakāṣṭha i.e. the Kuṭilaka and perhaps as a reverence to God Brahmā, Bharata prescribed this crooked stick as an accompaniment of the jester Vidūṣaka .

In the Vedic period when the human society was guided by the custom of Varṇāśrama, Brahmins were considered as belonging to elite class of the society and in fact it was so. But the most astonishing, amusing and interesting factor is that the character of Vidūṣaka has been pictured as belonging to that elite class of the society although Bharata did not prescribe that the Vidūṣakas should belong to Brahmin community solely. He prescribed that the Vidūṣakas should be 'Dvija' which includes the Kṣatriyas also although we see that they generally belong to Brahmin community.

However, during the period of Varṇāśrama, Brahmins being the descendants of the Aryans were regarded as men full of knowledge, wisdom, culture, austerity, purity etc. having a calm and placid appearance. They had a venerable and dignified position in the society. Everybody in the society including the Kings and Noblemen would look at them with utter reverence and dignity. The people at large would not dare mocking at them or making fun with them. They were the creators of all the Śāstras and literature. But gradually with the passage of time the firm grip of discipline of Varṇāśrama started becoming loose and perhaps a section of the so-called elite class of the society began to fall behind from those glorious characteristics of their class and vices and degraded qualities of character engulfed those Brahmins who were once regarded as performers of glorious and sacred acts and rituals and consequently began to indulge themselves in degraded activities and the people at large who once would look at them with the eyes of awe and heart-felt respect, began to enjoy the inferior qualities of those Brahmins. This left impression on their physical appearances also. Normally it is seen that a man who is enriched with lofty qualities of inner soul possesses a fresh, polished and placid appearance and the Brahmins who were descendants of the Aryans possessing elevated qualities of soul were very handsome looking. Opposite is noticed in the case of a man of degraded quality. The dramatists who stare at the society with microscopic eyes and analytical mind did not fail to notice them and they consciously introduced those in their theatrical performances through a character called Vidūṣaka who is a Brahmin only because of his birth in Brahmin community and only because he is the owner of a piece of sacred thread of Brahminhood called 'yajñopabīta' and

possesses the degraded characteristics as described above. He speaks in Prākṛta language which is the colloquial language of the lower class of the society. Bharata prescribed that the language of the Vidūṣaka should be Eastern Prākṛta. Once Sanskrit was the language of upper class of the society. But gradually Prākṛta began to establish itself as the main language of the common people and then even the Brahmins also were required to learn Sanskrit. Some of them could not learn it and so they were compelled to speak in Prākṛta language and the speeches of Vidūṣaka in Prākṛta indicate that the Vidūṣakas were educationally of inferior quality unlike the Brahmins in general. During that period education was Sanskrit-oriented and lack of knowledge of Sanskrit in that society is an indicator of the possibility of lack of education. So one may easily draw the inference that the Vidūṣakas were devoid of the knowledge of Sanskrit and consequently without education on the ground that if they knew Sanskrit they could easily speak in Sanskrit with the heroes, kings, noblemen, court men etc. who would speak with them in Sanskrit and could speak with the lower class of people in Prākṛta for their convenience. But in that case here is a confusion too. Throughout the dramatic performance it is seen that the heroes, noblemen, court-men etc. speak with the Vidūṣakas in Sanskrit and the Vidūṣakas give reply in Prākṛta. So, if they did not know Sanskrit, how could they understand the conversations of others in Sanskrit properly? Besides, it looks strange to accept how the Hero, a king or a nobleman, can select a person as his chief companion, as his assistant in love who is so ugly, fool and uneducated! Hence it may be that the Vidūṣakas were not really so. It may be that the dramatists had some purposes behind their presentation of the Vidūṣaka in this shape. The Vidūṣaka

was engaged to act as 'a panderer to the erotic hero and his fiancé with his foolhardiness and humour of low taste so that other people did not give him much importance and he could serve his purpose quite easily without drawing the attention of others.

Besides, there are other arguments which are attributed in favour of the justification of the use of Prākṛta by the Vidūṣaka . As discussed earlier, during that Period Prākṛta became the vernacular language of the common masses and the people barring a few members of the elite class of the society including the Brahmins used Prākṛta in place of Sanskrit as their vernacular language. As we see in our modern times, if a man belonging to upper class and having high education, takes part in the comic matters with common people and speaks in local language, it appears more funny and enjoyable for common people who witnesses it. There is no doubt that Sanskrit is a polished language and as the primary object of the Vidūṣaka was to create abuse and fun on the stage, its presentation through a language like Prākṛta which was the language of the common people would undoubtedly render it more funny, appealing and enjoyable to the larger section of the society and this is what the creator of the drama exactly wants because every creator of art does expect that his creation goes to the reach of as many people as is possible. Besides, as Keith thinks, it was hardly possible to accept that a man being a Brahmin playing the role of funny character of Vidūṣaka would abuse in the sacred language. So from all these we may come to the conclusion that the dramatists' objective of making the Vidūṣaka speak in Prākṛta bears a practical and social purpose, need and value. Dr. Bhadndarkar holds the opinion, "That a poet should make certain persons in his work speak their peculiar dialect, especially when that

is an inferior dialect and likely to create mirth, is natural; and their device is resorted to by writers in all countries. But it was probably more from considerations of propriety than liveliness that these languages (Prākṛta) began to be used by Sanskrit dramatists .....Similarly, the minute dereliction about the use of certain Prākṛta dialects in the case of certain persons are explicable only on the supposition that the original idea was to represent in the drama a state of things actually existing in the world."

It may also be that the dramatists wanted to create satire to show how some members of the elite class of the society having fallen from the highest stratum of dignified qualities of heart and soul, knowledge, wisdom and intellect worthy of their class were leading a base and inferior life under the veil of the precious cloak of their Brahminhood. We see that the Vidūṣakas being fool lead a life of flattering others only for the sake of earning livelihood. They use vulgar and abusive languages for the ladies and they are so accustomed with the abusive language that they use it even for inanimate things, birds, monkeys, bees etc. which is unbecoming, indecorous and indecent for the character of a Brahmin.

Vidūṣaka is not only a standing character but plays important role in the Nāṭaka also. Bharata gives him important position in theatrical company along with the Sūtradhāra and his Assistant. He is the comedian of the theatrical company and acts as the buffoon in every theatrical performances staged by the dramatist. He plays an important role in the preliminaries or the Pūrvaraṅga before the starting of the actual drama."That is called Sthāpanā where the Sūtradhāra, by holding conversation with the Naṭī, the Vidūṣaka

or the Naṭa introduces the theme.[6]" There is an essential part of Pūrvaraṅga which is termed as Trigata. It is eighteenth of the nineteen items of Pūrvaraṅga. Here the Vidūṣaka indulges himself in some irrelevant and funny talks with the Sūtradhāra and his Assistant causing smile in the face of Sūtradhāra and also laughter among the audience before the play starts actually.

6. J.T.Parikh, page no. 6

2. Bhāsa's Treatment of the characters of Vidūṣaka

Now let us discuss about the different traits of the characters of Vidūṣakas from general point of view as depicted by the famous dramatists like Bhāsa and Kālidāsa in their dramas and as Bhāsa precedes Kālidāsa, it will be justified to discuss first about the different aspects of the characters of Vidūṣaka portrayed by Bhāsa.

Santuṣṭa

(in Bhāsa's Avimārakam)

The character of Vidūṣaka in Avimārakam is a superb creation of Bhāsa, the great poet. In fact the creation of this character placed Bhāsa in the highest throne of his fame and popularity. The Vidūṣaka in Bhāsa's Avimārakam bears an ironical name Santuṣṭa. Although the meaning of his name is 'contented', he hardly shows any indication which establishes that his character bears any symptom of being contented and happy about food and other things like ornaments etc.

Now before entering deep into the analysis of the character of Santuṣṭa, let us see in a nutshell how far Santuṣṭa who appears in three Acts out of five of Avimārakam bears the qualifications as prescribed by Bharata in his Nāṭyaśāstra. According to Bharata, the Vidūṣaka should be a Brahmin, should bear extraordinary fondness for food and should be a fool and while going to analyze the character of Santuṣṭa we will easily see that his character possesses these three essential qualifications as laid down by Bharata. At the very beginning of Act. II of the drama we see the appearance of

Santuṣṭa with his usual fondness for food and foolishness. He is so coveted and fool that even one 'Ceṭī'- a maid-servant, named Candrikā can easily and successfully deceive him alluring him of food and ornaments. His arguments with Candrikā proves himself before the audience to be an uneducated person. But he pretends to be an educated person and boasts of his knowledge. When Candrikā tells him that she is in search of a Brahmin with a view to inviting him for food, Santuṣṭa argues, "Then who am I? Am I a Buddhist Mendicant?[7]" Candrikā counters, 'You have no Vedic scholarship' and this ignites the vainglory of Santuṣṭa about his depth of knowledge and wisdom. He claims that he is never devoid of Vedic scholarship[8]. He refers Rāmāyaṇa as a 'Nāṭyaśāstra' and claims that he was able to read five Ślokas of it in less than one year.[9] On hearing this the Ceṭī taunts, "I see, I see! This intelligence and knowledge is appropriate for your pedigree.[10]" Santuṣṭa further claims that not only he could be able to read five Ślokas of it but was able to comprehend their meaning also. He also boasts that a Brahmin like him who knows alphabet as well as their meaning is rare.[11] But Candrikā

7 विदूषक -भोदि! अहं को, समणओ

8 चेटी -----तुवं किल अवेदिओ

9 विदूषक - किस्स अहम अवेदिओ सुणाहि दाव। रामाअणं। णाम णट्टसत्थं। तस्सि पञ्च सुलोआ असम्पुण्णे संवछचरे मए पठिदा।

10 जाणामि जाणामि। अय्यस्स कुलोइदो ईदिसो मेधाविभावो।

11 विदूषक- ण केवलं सुलोआ एव, तेसं अत्थो वि मुणिओ। अण्णं च। अवरो विसेसो, बम्हणो दुल्लहो अवखरञ्जो अ।

who appears to be more intelligent and cunning than Santuṣṭa is not obviously impressed with his learning and proceeds to take a test of his knowledge and asks him to read one letter carved on her ring and quite naturally he fails in the test and makes a soliloquy that he does not know the letter but even then does not surrender. On the contrary he pretends to think over it and tells like a pragmatic man that his book does not contain that letter.[12] All these arguments of Santuṣṭa himself render him to be an embodiment of laughter and caricature. Then Santuṣṭa discloses one degraded identity of his character. Previously if anyone wanted to offer food to a real Brahmin it was compulsory for him to give him 'Dakṣiṇā' i.e. fee after the meal. In fact the said fee was considered to be a social veneration given to the Brahmin community and the absence of that fee after meal offered to a Brahmin was considered to be a disgrace to the Brahmin community. Neither any member of an inferior class or community would dare refraining from paying that fee to Brahmin community after offering him meal nor the Brahmin community as a whole would agree to accept this behaviour of anybody of the society. Rather they would become very much annoyed and angry. But opposite happens in the case of Santuṣṭa . When Candrikā becomes confirmed about Santuṣṭa's ignorance, she proposes him to take food without fee and he without caring a fig for the legitimate dignity of his community gladly agrees to her proposal and thus leaves proof of his highly gluttonous character. Just then

12 विदूषक (आत्मगतम्) अजाणमाणो किं भणिस्सं। (वीचार्य) भोदु दिट्ठ। एवं दाव भणिस्सं। (प्रकाशम्) भोदि ! इदं अक्खरं मम पत्थए णत्थि।

he proves himself to be an utter fool. Candrikā, the cunning maid, wants to see his ring and when Santuṣṭa being deceived by her cunningness hands over the ring to her, she, by dint of her remarkable cunningness becomes successful to deceive him and flees away along with that ring and then there remains nothing for the Vidūṣaka but to lament for the ring. Here he reveals the quality of abuse of the character of Vidūṣaka. He passes some abusive remarks about Candrikā --- Chināl, Adharmadāsī and Kumbhadāsī which are very much disgraceful remarks about a woman and its utterance is quite unbecoming for the character of a dignified Brahmin. This gives ample proof that he belongs to the degraded section of the then Brahmin community. Which rouses humour more in the mind of the audience here is that he laments for the ring stating that he is deceived by that unrighteous maid only for his greed of food and the irony of fate is that he is deprived both of his ring and the food.[13] This places him as a glutton to the highest degree. There are many other places in this drama where his qualification as glutton as prescribed by Bharata is revealed.

He has sense of beauty but that centers round his fondness for food. In the next scene we see him to be charmed about the beauty of the city in the setting Sun. But while going to describe the said beauty he becomes prey of his inherent characteristics of extreme fondness for food. He compares the white mansion in the light of setting Sun to a ball of curds and

13 विदूषक ---(सर्वतो विलोक्य) चन्दिए! चन्दि! कहिंए कहिं चंन्दिआ हा वंचिदो म्हि। गंडभेददासीए सीलं आणंतो वि अत्तणो भोअणविस्सम्भेण छालिदो म्हि (परिक्रम्य) भोअणं वि सलिअं चिंतेति। Act—II

the Sun to the mixture of molasses and honey.[14] When Avimāraka waits anxiously for Santuṣṭa for giving him the good news that he has found out a way to meet his fiancé Kuruṅgī - the princess, and asks him the cause of his late arrival, Santuṣṭa says, "As you think day in and day out like a Brahmin duped of an invitation for dinner, I also come back to lie beside you after roaming in the city all the day like an ordinary prostitute deprived of enjoyment."[15] When Nalinikā brings materials of toilette for her Princes Kuraṅgī, Santuṣṭa raises the question about what the utility of the materials is for the Princes when she is sad and is weeping. Rather she should bring some food stuff and he will sit in the line first. All these reveal his greed for food and the comic side of his character.

Santuṣṭa is the dearest companion of Avimāraka. There is a deep friendship between them. None can bear the separation from other. When in Act IV Santuṣṭa misses Avimāraka for long and becomes highly anxious about his well being, he vows, "I will search for him in the whole world and either find out him or his body. If I can't see him, I shall be his assistant in the next life.[16]" Such is the devotion of Santuṣṭa to

14 अहो णअरस्स सोहा संपदि। अत्थं आसादिदो भअवं सुय्यो दीसइ दहिपिण्डपण्डरेसु पासादेसु अग्गापणलिन्देसु पसारिअगुलमहुरससडगदो विअ। Act—II

15 तुमं दाव आमन्तणविप्पलद्धो विअ बम्हणो अहोरत्तं चिन्तेसि। अहं पि दाव दिसरे णअरं परिब्भमिअ अलद्धभोआ पाअडगणिआ विअ रत्तिं पस्सदो सइदुं आअच्छामि।

16 अहं वि कुमारं वा कुमारस्स सरीरं वा पेक्खिस्सामि दाव सव्वलोअं परिब्भमिअ। जदि ण पेक्खामि, तत्तहोदो परत्त सहाओ होमि। ACT---IV

his royal friend. Avimāraka also holds Santuṣṭa in high esteem. To him Santuṣṭa is -

"Laughable in society,
a fighter in conflicts
Preceptor in grief,
in front of foes undaunted:
My heart's great festival,
but these wordy bubbles.
Are enough ! 'Tis my body
in two divided.[17]"

But Avimāraka does not want to miss the chance of relishing the warm relationship with his companion by pinching him very tactfully about his ignorance. In Act II when Avimāraka expresses his determination to enter into Kanyāpur with a view to meeting his fiancé Kuraṅgī - the princes, and Santuṣṭa does not agree to let him go alone, Avimāraka places some arguments and wittily says that he will have to enter into Kanyāpur by any means and so the Mahābrāhmaṇa may accord permission. Here the word 'Mahābrāhmaṇa' is used in ironical sense but Santuṣṭa does not mind anything and continues to behave as usual. Rather he says that he will not let him go alone and will accompany him because someone is

17 गोष्टीषु हास्यः समरेषु योधः
शोके गुरुः साहसिकः परेषु ।
महत्सो मे हृदि किं प्रलापै-
र्दिधाविभक्तं खलु मे शरीरम् ॥

needed to raise hue and cry if any danger comes before the Prince.[18] It is a very humorous argument indeed. He will accompany his friend only to raise hue and cry at the event of any danger instead of assisting and trying to rescue his friend with physical force like a brave man. Santṣṭa knows his limitation very well.

Santuṣṭa enters into the palace of Kanyāpur with Avimāraka invisibly. Here he creates a highly funny situation. Santuṣṭa all on a sudden and unexpectedly confronts Nalinikā and finding no other alternative, claims himself to be a woman[19]. Indeed at this situation the audience can not resist the temptation of bursting into loud laughter. He creates superb fun in the private apartment of Kuraṅgī. Being impatient to be united with her beloved Prince Avimāraka, Kuraṅgī sheds tears and noticing tears in her eyes Santuṣṭa says, "I wish to cry. But the problem is that tears do not come to my eyes. This is very rare thing. When my father expired, I tried much to weep but tears did not come to my eyes. How can I cry for the misery of somebody else? Yet I will weep with you without being worried[20]"

Santuṣṭa is a Brahmin simply because he is born in that community. The logic is very much simple and clear to him. He is a Brahmin because he puts on the sacred thread -

18 कहं मं उज्झिअ गच्छसि । अहं भवन्तं सव्वकालं ण मुञ्चामि अक्कोसन्तो वि एक्को इच्छिदव्वो । Act-II

19 को अण्णो जणो मं पेक्खिअ पुरिसो त्ति भणादि । इत्थिआ खु अहं । Act-V

20 अवह अहम् वि रोदामि । एक्कं पि तहिं दुल्लहं मम णअणादो बप्फं ण पिग्गच्छइ । जदा मे पिदा उवरदो, तद वि महन्तेण आरम्भेण रोदितुं आरद्धो । बप्फं ण पिग्गच्छइ कि पुण अण्णसन्दावस्स । तह वि अणुस्सुओ रोदामि ।

yajñopavīta. If he wears a red loincloth he becomes a mendicant and if he throws away dress, he becomes a Śramaṇaka (Jain Mendicant)[21]. He appears to be a funny Brahmin to Kuraṅgī and Nalinikā considers him to be a stupid Brahmin.

In fact the stupidity of his character is manifested sometimes through his behaviour. He is unable to understand the impatience of Avimāraka to be united with his fiancé Kuraṅgī. When Kuraṅgī being extremely restless to be united with her beloved Avimāraka sheds tears, he can not understand its significance and thinks that the tears in her eyes are due to her hunger. When Nalinikā tries to drag him away only to give a scope to Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī to meet in private, he fails to understand her real intention and shouts loudly to save him.[22] When Nalinikā urges him to go with her, he replies that he may go provided food is offered to him because food should be given to a guest. Nalinikā agrees to give him her ornaments. Santuṣṭa just like a practical minded man and because of his previous experience of being deceived by one Ceṭī, does not believe her and wants to get the ornaments first in his hand because his argument is that only the utterance of the word 'ghi'(clarified butter) can not remove bile.[23] Here Nalinikā throws him in great danger. After giving him her ornaments she says, "Taking all my ornaments you

21 विदूषक --आम भोदि। जण्णोपवीदेण वम्हणो, चीवरेण रत्तपडो। जदि वत्थं अवणेमि, समणो होमि Act-V

22 अब्बम्हण्णं अब्बम्हण्णं। Act–V

23 णहि घिदवअणेण पित्तं णस्सदि। मम हत्थगदं करेहि। Act–V

have become my husband. So come now.[24]" Saying this she catches his hands. At this stage the danger of Santuṣṭa knows no bounds and in utter helplessness the poor Brahmin utters the words, "Kindly do not act in this manner, Madam ! I am very feeble[25]." In these manners Santuṣṭa create profuse fun for the audience.

But it is not always true that he is always guided by the stupidity of character. Sometimes he talks like a prudent man. When Avimāraka expresses his firm determination to enter into Kanyāpur alone on that very day, he becomes anxious because the Ministers of Kuntībhoja are very dangerous and so he wants to accompany him and advises him to take shelter in the house of one of his friends there and wait for appropriate moment at night for this purpose. It is the advice of a matured brain. Also he possesses some quality to appreciate real beauty. When Avimāraka staying in invisible condition praises the beauty of the princes- Kuraṅgī, Santuṣṭa describes her beauty to be like that of new crescent moon. At this Avimāraka wonders about the unexpected 'wisdom' of Santuṣṭa, but he (Santuṣṭa) replies in cool brain like a wise man, "Dear friend ! You laugh at me because you know me for long. Unknown persons do not know the quality of my wisdom. Hence they praise me more. Knowing this I do not grow intimacy with anybody else of this city.[26]" He has also an eye of observation.

24 मम सव्वाभरणं गहिणअ बल्लहो जादो। एंहिं दाव। Act–V

25 भोदि ! मा मा एवं। अदिसुमारो खु अहं। Act---V

26 भो ! णिच्चपरिचएण मं परिहिस। अपुव्वो जणो मम बुद्धिं अजाणन्तो अहिअदरं पसंसेदि। अहं पि तं जाणि अ एदस्मिं णअरे केण वि विस्सम्भं ण करोमि। Act---V

In Act V the Princes indulges herself in a very comic situation by attempting to commit suicide by hanging using her scarf but suddenly on hearing the sound of thunder she stops doing so and in utter fear begins to shout, "Save me, save me." To be highly afraid of the sound of thunder for one who is determined to commit suicide is a highly finny matter. Santuṣṭa notices this and when the Princes calls him a 'laughing-stock' he counters this and refers to this situation and says that he is not at all a 'laughing-stock. Rather it is she (Kuraṅgī) who is a laughing-stock because she attempted to do something judging her own condition but stopped doing so on hearing the sound of thunder.[27]

He possesses some qualities of using simile although sometimes funny and glutton-like. He compares the white mansion in the light of setting Sun to ball of curds and the Sun to the mixture of molasses and honey. He compares the beauty of the Princes Kuraṅgī to the new crescent moon. When in the Act V Avimāraka staying in invisible condition asks to follow him very carefully so that the sound of his footsteps does not become audible to others, he replies, "Can anyone eat something without making it ort?[28]" i.e. without making unholy by the touch of tongue.

27 को एत्थ मम अस्सद्धअं भणादि I अहं ण हस्सो, तत्तहोदी एव हस्सा I जा अत्तणा अवत्थ जाणिअ किं कत्तुं ववसिअ मेहसद् दं सुणिअ सव्वं विसुमरिअ पडिदा I.

28 भो ! ण सक्कं एदं I को सकदि ऊच्छिट्ठ ण करन्तो भुञ्जिदुम I Act---V

Vasantaka

(in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa)

Unlike many other dramas of eminent Sanskrit dramatists, the presence of Vidūṣaka in this drama Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa by the great poet Bhāsa is not so remarkable. He appears only in one Act of this drama i.e. in Act III. He lacks many of the essential qualifications of Vidūṣaka prescribed by Bharata.

The first and foremost qualification of him which corresponds to the prescription of Bharata is that his name is Vasantaka – a name given after the name of a season. He possesses the essential qualification which is common to all other Vidūṣakas and that is his extreme fondness for food. Also he is a Brahmin and this is the qualification for which he becomes eligible to get the gift of a temple i.e. 'modaka'. At the very beginning of the Act we see Vasantaka to enter into the stage in the guise of a beggar who after receiving the 'modaka' from the temple along with his legitimate fees of Brahminhood kept the same in a bundle of cloth on the 'verandah' (portico) of the temple and found the same missing. At once his extreme craze for food i.e. the 'modaka' arises in his mind and he begins to explore the probable source of theft. He hesitates to accept the madman to be the probable thief because so far as he recollects, the madman did not come after him after getting one piece of 'modaka' from him. Then he thinks whether a dog can flee away taking that bundle of cloth. But, as he thinks, that is also not possible because the walls of the temple are very high and it is not also possible that any pedestrian will commit

the offence. Then he is confused to think whether he himself devoured them all. This indicates that his memory is very week. Also he thinks that perhaps the Lord Śiva has stolen the same and finding something like his bundle of cloth containing his 'modaka' under the feet of Lord Śiva he proceeds to collect the same from there but fails. Then he prays fervently to Lord Śiva to give him back his bundle of cloth thus creating a highly funny situation. Then he suddenly sees the madman with the 'modaka' in his hand. Immediately he begins to chase the madman courageously to snatch his 'modaka' from him. Somehow he manages to stop the madman and threatens to break his head with his stick. He tries his best to get back his 'modaka' from his hand but fails. He has not so much ability and courage to compel the madman to give him back the 'modaka'. Rather the madman makes fun of him. But when the Śramaṇaka appears on the stage he at ease succeeds in compelling the madman to give back the 'modaka' simply threatening to curse him unless he gives back the 'modaka'. This proves how week and helpless the personality of Vasantaka is.

Unlike other Vidūṣakas, Vasantaka in this drama is not much source of fun and amusement. In fact in this drama Bhāsa has not provided much scope to the Vidūṣaka to indulge in comic situation excepting the episode of stealing 'modaka' by the madman and here also the fun and amusement are of very poor quality. Seeing this situation the audience can at best smile slightly but can not giggle loudly in amusement. So in this drama the Vidūṣaka lacks one of his essential quality i.e. fun

and caricature in proper and adequate manner.

As Vasantaka appears on the stage in the guise of a beggar, his dress must be shabby and filthy. Similarly his language is unpolished. The abusive side of the character of Vidūṣaka is revealed in one occasion when Vasantaka compares the smell of his breath to that of the wind passing from the urinary bladder of a swine.[29]

As we know from the definitions of eminent dramaturges like Bharata, Śāradatanaya etc. the Vidūṣaka plays the role of companion in love to the erotic Hero and enjoys his close association. But here in this drama Vasantaka gets little opportunity to maintain close association with the King Udayana because being captivated by Mahāsen- the king of Abantī, Udayana is now in prison. We do not see him to talk with the hero nor do we see him to attempt to relieve the stress of the hero by dint of his wit and fun. He has no such scope. Vasantaka can neither help Udayana in his love-affair nor does he approve the love-affair of the king with Vāsavadattā because that will act as serious setback for the execution of their secret plan to rescue the king from the prison of Mahāsen. He says that the king has converted the prison to pleasure-garden.[30] Thus he lacks the essential qualification of being the true confidant of the hero in love although like a true detective he is able to collect information about Udayana- his Master in captivity. At one time he, being despair about the

29 ही ही वुड्ढो विअ सूअरवत्थी सुद्धवादं एव्व उग्गिरामि I Act-III

30 वन्धणं दाणि पामदवणं सम्भाविअ पउत्तो राअलीलं कत्तुं I Act-III

success of their plan of rescuing the king, expresses his desire to leave the king in that condition[31] which is not expected from a Vidūṣaka who is supposed to stay with his master like his shadow.

But the Minister Yaugandharāyaṇa does not approve this intention of Vasantaka. He becomes offended at this and says to Vasantaka with displeasure, "Is this speech worthy of Vidūṣaka? No, no, Vasantaka ! Do not tell in this manner. We can not leave him at this stage because being afflicted with misery and pangs of love he is now dependent on friends and in this miserable time he is unable to decide appropriate duty." Then the Minister tries to explore an alternative way to rescue the king. This is exactly what a Vidūṣaka is rightly expected to think for his Master.

31 भो ! दंसिदो सिणेहो I णिव्विटठ पुरुसआरं I साहु उज्झिअ णं गच्छामो I Act-III

Vasantaka

(in Svapnavāsavadattam)

The renowned dramatist Bhāsa named his Vidūṣaka in his drama Svapnavāsavadattam as Vasantaka i.e. named after Spring season obeying the prescription of the ancient dramaturges. Although Vasantaka possesses some basic qualities of Vidūṣaka, his presence in the drama is not so remarkable. He played the role here as a stereotype and mechanical Vidūṣaka. He is a glutton which we understand from an indirect way, a true companion of the king and an ease-loving person.

We see him first at the very beginning of Act IV where he gladly declares that he has been living an easeful life in the royal residence, bathing in the lake of the inner apartment, consuming abundant sweet 'modaka' (Sweet balls) on the occasion of the marriage of the king Udayana with Padmāvatī and is feeling that he has been passing the days in heaven not infested by the nymphs. But he laments that he is not being able to digest the coveted foods and is unable to sleep at night even on the bed adorned with beautiful cover as if he has been attacked by blood poisoning.[32] This indicates that he is essentially a glutton and the manner in which he moans for his inability to eat more food is humorous. Getting abundance of excellent food in the royal residence, he has consumed so much that his stomach has become out of order. It causes humour but, of course, of crude nature. Humour which lacks a

32 एक्को खु महन्त दोसो, मम आहारो सुठ्ठु ण परिणमदि I सुपच्छदणाए सय्याए णिद्दं ण लभामि, जह वादसोणिदं अभिदो विअ वत्तदि त्ति पेक्खामि

touch of finer sense invariably becomes transient. When the Ceṭī enters, he asks her to bring everything excepting food.[33] This signifies not his aversion but the helplessness of a glutton to accept highly coveted food when there is abundance of it. This condition of the Vidūṣaka creates humuor a little.

Now, let us have a brief idea about the background of the story of this drama. Udayana, the king of Vatsa is the descendent of the Purus who would rule the whole world and whose capital was in Hastināpura. But Udayana forgot the reminiscences of them, lost the urge of extending his kingdom vanquishing other kings and is satisfied with the small kingdom 'Vatsa' over which he is ruling. But his Minister Yaugandharāyaṇa wants that his master i.e. Udayana- the King shakes off his inertia and tries to conquer other kings and extend the size of his kingdom. But in this regard the king of Magadha will be his toughest enemy. So, to remove the obstacle, Yaugandharāyaṇa makes a secret plan with Rumanvān, the General, and Gopālaka-the brother of Vāsavadattā who is the queen of king Udayana to bind the king of Magadha and Udayana in the bondage of relationship by arranging somehow the marriage of Udayana with Padmavatī, the loving daughter of the king of Magadha. But the king of Magadha will not accept their proposal if he hears that Udayana is married. So they make a secret plan in which the queen Vāsavadattā herself is a party. Next day

33 सव्वं आणेदु मोदी वज्जिअ भोअणं I Act IV

Yaugandharāyaṇa proposes to the king to go to Lāvaṇaka- a frontier village of the kingdom for hunting. The King accepts his proposal and goes there with his beloved queen Vāsavadattā and his company. One day when the king is out for hunting, Yaugandharāyaṇa tactfully sets fire in the palacial residence and declares that the queen Vāsavadattā is burnt to death and the Minister also lost his life in his vain attempt to rescue her. From this point the story of this drama starts.

Yaugandharāyaṇa in the guise of a Brahmin mendicant comes to Tapovana with queen Vāsavadattā in the guise of his sister Avantikā and successfully manages to keep Vāsavadattā in the safe custody of Padmāvatī. Intimacy begins to grow between them i.e. Padmāvatī and Vāsavdattā alias Avantikā. On the other hand gradually the king of Magadha comes to know that Udayana is widower and gladly weds her daughter Padmāvatī to Udayana and in this connection we see Vasantaka first on the stage lamenting that owing to heavy consumptions of sweetmeat in the marriage ceremony his stomach has become out of order and he is unable to consume anymore.

Vasantaka leaves proof of his gluttonous nature at the very beginning of his appearance. In another place while telling about Padmāvatī he says, "She has a great virtue. Taking juicy foodstuff in her hand she says, "Where is Āryavasantaka!"[34] His entire thought revolves round kitchen. When the King Udayana meets Vāsavadattā in his drowsiness in the Samudragṛha and describes the same very seriously to Vasantaka, he, out of

34 पदुमावदी तरुणी दंसणीआ अकोवणा अणहङ्कारा महुरवाआ सदक्खिञ्ञा I अअं च अवरो महंतो गुणो सिनिद्धेण भोअणेण मं पच्चुग्गच्छइ कहिं णु खु गदो अय्यवसंतओ त्ति ? Act-IV

stupidity, proposes to the king to go to the kitchen.[35]

Sometimes he can give good advice to the king like a prudent man e.g. "Oh my king! Have patience. Destiny is inviolable"[36] or "A good act creates pleasure when it is recognized by good manners"[37]. At times he expresses some sense of beauty. Describing the beauty of the pleasure garden he says, "Brabho! Brabho! At the time of plucking, flowers in small quantities fell on the ground and made the pleasure garden full of beauty."[38] He sees the flights of storks and says, "Bravo! Bravo! The beautiful flights of storks are passing through the clear sky of the Autumn."[39] Sometimes he can critically analyse something and come to the conclusion. In the pleasure garden he can correctly assess that Queen Padmāvatī surely came there noticing that the Śephālikā flowers have been plucked.[40] He, as king Udayana thinks, is a talkative. He is also a coward. Seeing a garland in dim light in the Samudragṛha he takes it for a snake and becomes highly scared. But sometimes he shows some presence of mind. When in the pleasure garden the king Udayana remembering his beloved queen Vāsavadattā sheds tears, Vasantaka goes to fetch water

35 मा दार्णी भवं अणत्थं चिंतिअ I एदु एदु भवं I चअस्सालं पविसामो I Act—V

36 धारेदु धारेदु भवं I अनदीक्कमणीओ हि विही I Act—IV

37 सक्कारो हि णाम सक्कारेण पडिच्छिदो पीदिं उप्पादेदि I Act-IV

38 पचिअ-पडिअ-वन्धुजीवकुसुम –विरलवादरमणिज्जं पमदवनं I (Act-IV)

39 सरअकालणिम्मले अंतरिक्खे पसादिअवलदेवबाहुदंसेणीअं सारसपंति जाव समाहिदं गच्छंति पेक्सदु दाव भवं I Act—IV

40 इमाणि अवइदकुसुमाणि सेफालिआगुच्छआणि पेक्खदु दाव भवं I Act – IV

for washing his face and Padmāvatī comes there and wants to know what happened there, Vasantaka tactfully says that tears came in the eyes of the king because the pollen of Kāśa (catkin) flowers fell in it.[41] The abusive side of Vasantaka's character is revealed when we see him to use abusive language towards the bees. He calls them as "Dāsya putrah" which means 'illegitimate child.' These are some of the instances of the qualities of the character of Vasantaka – the Vidūṣaka.

But we do not see him to play one of the most vital role of the character of Vidūṣaka and that the role of companion of the hero in love. In fact he has not that opportunity also. The king Udayana is not engaged in secret love. A blind love for the heroine does not madden his heart. So he is not required to spend the anxious days planning for finding a way to conquer her. He is also not required to endeavour personally to marry Padmāvatī and has no need to seek the assistance of his Vidūṣaka to fulfill his mission of love.

But Vasantaka played one important role. He was successful in inducing Udayana's attitude towards Vāsavadattā after his marriage with Padmāvatī.

41 भोदि ! वादणदेण कासकुसुमरेणुणा अक्खिणिपडिदेण सस्सुपादं खु तत्तहीदो मुहं I Act IV

Maitreya

(in Cārudattam)

The name of the Vidūṣaka in Bhāsa's Cārudattam is Maitreya. We see him first to enter into the stage in Act-I uttering some words of refusal of an invitation for food. Sutradhāra invites him informing him that there is huge arrangement of delicious food like hot soup, curry, pickle, ghee, molasses, rice along with some fees of brāhamaṇa. But Maitreya continues to refuse it. From this it seems that he is not a glutton. But simultaneously his muttering of some words regarding the said invitation indicates that he has not complete apathy for such type of invitation. So although against the allurement of delicious food offered by the Sutradhāra he says that a man does not consume the stone of a sweet mango,[42] he does not get support of the inner core of his heart in favour of his refusal. It appears that he refuses the invitation not from his heart but out of his sense of dignity. Once his master Cārudatta was a highly wealthy person. Then by virtue of his position as a confidant of the hero he consumed huge delicious food with proper dignity and prestige. But Cārudatta, his friend, has now lost his wealth and obviously Maitreya is passing his days in hardship. But his sense of self- respect prevents him from accepting invitation from others because it may seem that by inviting him they are showering compassion on him which will undermine the social prestige of his master although inwardly

42 अहिअमहुरस्स अम्वस्स अजोग्गदाए अट्टि ण मक्खीअदि त्ति ।

he feels some mental hesitation to refuse the invitation. His soliloquy at this stage indicates that he is not a voracious glutton like some other Vidūṣakas. His stomach is satisfied with any quantity of food – scanty or abundant.[43] Although his muttering as discussed above evokes some strained humour, we do not find him as a source of much humour in this drama.

But he is a true and whole-heartedly dedicated companion of the hero, not a fair-weather friend of him. So although Cārudatta has become poor and he has little scope to squeeze wealth from him, Maitreya does not desert him. His master's distress and financial hardship instill deep agony in his heart. As Cārudatta pines for the loss of his wealth, he consoles him like a near and dear one saying, "Don't lament. The more you will pine for the loss of money, the more it will aggravate.[44]" Cārudatta himself gives him the prestigious position of his true partner both in weal and woe.

Not that his mind is full of sympathy for his master only, he is equally sympathetic even for inferiors persons. When Śakāra and Viṭa manhandle the Ceṭī Radanikā, he consoles her affectionately and asks her to be free from mental perturbation and forbids her to disclose the incident inside the home[45] because he perhaps feels that Radanikā's disgrace will increase further for that.

43 मं उदरं उवत्थाविसेसं जाणादि । अप्पेणावितुस्सादि । वहुअं वि ओदणभरं भरिस्सदि दीअमाणणं । ण आएदि अदीअमाणं, पच्चाचिक्खदि । Act-I

44 धणविणाश दुक्खस्स पुणचिन्तिअमाणस्स वसन्ते वुड्ढस्स विअ अङ्कुरङ्कुरा उब्भमण्ति । ता अलं भवदो सन्तावेण । Act-I

45 अवणीअदु दे हिअअमण्णू । अअं बुत्तन्तो अब्भन्तरं ण पेसिदव्वो

In this drama the comic side of the character of Maitreya is almost absent. We get some touch of this side of his character when he, while sleeping with the basket of jewellery, hands over the same to the burglar Sajjalaka mistaking him in his drowsiness to be Cārudatta.

We find him to be a chicken- hearted person when he fears to go alone in the midst of darkness of night[46] to worship goddess as desired by Cārudatta and feels safe to take with him one Cetī - Radanikā. There he meets Śakāra and Viṭa who manhandle Radanikā misunderstanding her to be Vasantasenā who being chased by them takes shelter in the house of Cārudatta . Śakāra threatens Maitreya to tell his master Cārudatta to hand over Vasantasenā to him next morning otherwise he will break his (Maitreya's) skull. But in spite of that he does not convey to Cārudatta in toto what Śakāra told him. He tells him only a portion of his threatening speech. He conceals the words of threat of Śakāra to break his skull and tells Cārudatta that Śakāra put a demand on him to hand over Vasantasenā to him next morning. Maitreya is a true companion of Cārudatta. So it is not his intention to increase his heartache by conveying unpleasant matters to him as it will be highly humiliating for his master.

He has strong aversion to music. When Cārudatta praises the tune of music played by him in his Vīṇā (a kind of musical heptachord) Maitreya expresses his dislike for the Vīṇā and its tune. He compares a male singer to an odd looking

46 एआई अहं कहं गमिस्सं

priest wearing garlands of red flowers and a female singer to a cow with perforated septum of its nose that looks ugly.[47]

He possesses some ego as a Brahmin too. When Cārudatta entering home asks his servant to wash his feet, Maitreya asks him to wash his feet also.

He is poor but not greedy. He thinks that if wealth robs his sleep, he will better prefer to remain poor.[48] Cārudatta's wife intends to offer some gift to him. But seeing it Maitreya does not proceed to accept it greedily and tells her gently with polite heart that the excessiveness of this type of gift does not suit her financial condition.[49] But when he understands after discussing with Radanikā that his refusal will agonise his mistress's heart, he accepts it. He has a real soft corner for his master. So the tiny drops of tears which come in[50] the eyes of Brāhmaṇī i.e. Cārudatta's wife, his eyes do not pass over it. But though he accepts the jewellery he does not keep it for himself.

47 मम खु दाव गाअन्तो मणुस्सो इत्थिआ वि पठन्ती उभअं आदर ण देदि । गाअन्तो दाव मणुस्सो रत्तसुमणवेठिठदो विअ पुरोहिदो दिढ ण सोहइ । इत्थिआ वि पठन्ती छिण्णणासिआ विअ धेणुआ अदिविरुवा होइ । Act—III

48 अहं खु दाव कत्तव्वकिरत्थीकदसंकेदो विअ सक्किअसमणओ णिद्दं ण लभामि । वामं खु मे अक्खि फन्देदि । चोरो सन्धिं छिन्ददी बिअ पेक्खामि । जइ ईदिसी अवत्था अत्थाणं, जादीए दरिद्दो एव्व होमि । Act –III

49 अवत्थाविरुद्धो खु अअं पदाणविभवो । कुदो एवस्स आगमो ।

50 रोदियो विअ भोदिए दिट्ठि

He understands that his master is now suffering from acute financial stringency. He is in love with Vasantasenā. But the jewellery which Vasantasenā kept in his custody has been stolen and if he can not return her the jewellery, his total prestige will be shattered thoroughly. So he gives it to his master to give the same to Vasantasenā in lieu of her own jewellery to save the honour of his master before his beloved. He, at the same time, is alert that this offer of him to his master does not hurt his sense of dignity. He knows that if his master comes to know that Brahmaṇī gifted the jewellery to him after performing a ritual to get the blessing of a Brahmin, his master will never accept it. On the contrary he may feel insulted for the offer thinking of his wretched financial plight. So he conceals the fact from his master and tells him that his noble-hearted mistress handed over the jewellary to him for her husband for the purpose of giving it to his beloved Vasantasenā in lieu of her own. This jewellary is far more valuable than those of Vasantasenā kept in the custody of Cārudatta and ultimately lost. How generous Maitreya is at least so far as his relation with Cārudatta is concerned! Moreover, besides playing the role of comedian, Vidūṣakas play an important role and that is his role as a confidant to the hero in love. Here Maitreya plays a role in the union of Cārudatta and his beloved Vasantasenā in this way.

3. Comparison of the characters of Vidūṣaks of Bhāsa with each other.

Bhāsa wrote thirteen plays out of which four plays i.e. Avimārakam, Svapnavāsavadattam, Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa and Cārudattam provide loving characters of Vidūṣaka who are sources of fun, humour and enjoyment. Joydeva, the famous Sanskrit poet in his book Prasannarāghava compared Bhāsa to the smile of Kavitākāmini and said 'Bhāsohāsah' and 'Kavitākāminikautukāyah'. In fact Bhāsa is correctly recognized as a humourist of the first water because of his creation of simple characters of Vidūṣakas with funny, witty and satirical dialogues.

If we proceed to compare the different characters of Vidūṣaka created by Bhāsa we will see that Santuṣṭa in Avimāraka is the best of the lot. In fact Santuṣṭa is the superb creation of Bhāsa and owing to this creation only Bhāsa occupied the peak position of his fame.

Vidūṣakas besides providing profuse fun and amusement are to play the important role as the panderer of the hero in love and his fiancé, to assist the hero in overcoming the adverse situation arising out of the conflict between the existing wife of the hero and his secret lover and to pacify the anger or strong opposition of the existing wife or wives of the hero against his secret love- affair. But the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa are not seen to play these roles. In fact they have no such scope to play these roles. They are not required to have recourse to tricks to win the love of the fiancés for the heroes because those lovers are willingly in love with the heroes. They are not

required to devise plans for maintaining secrecy about the love-affair of the heroes so that the existing wife or wives of the heroes can not smell anything fishy in the behavior of their husbands and can not create obstacles against the attempt of the heroes to win the love of their lovers.

We see that Avimāraka has no wife and his lady-love Kurańgī herself feels deep love and attraction for him. So Avimāraka faces no obstacle either from the side of his family nor from the side of Kurańgī. So Santuṣṭa has no chance to play his role in the love affair of the king.

In Cārudatta, Brahamaṇī, the wife of Cārudatta is so much generous, broad-minded and devoted to her husband that she never opposes her husband's craze for the harlot Vasantasenā. On the contrary she acts as a catalyst in the fulfillment of her husband's love-affair. As the ornaments of Vasantasenā kept under the custody of Cārudatta is stolen by the burglar owing to the utter folly of the Vidūṣaka and Cārudatta faces the acute problem of losing his prestige before Vasantasenā, it is his wife Brāhamaṇī who appears as his savior and offers her precious necklace very tactfully to Vasantaka so that it reaches to the hand of her husband and finally at the hand of Vasantasenā in lieu of her own less valuable jewelleries and her husband is rescued from facing a disgraceful situation before Vasantasenā and the path of their union becomes smooth. So Maitreya, like Vasantaka in Svapnavāsavadattam is neither required to employ himself in the service of the king for the fulfillment of his mission of his secret love nor he is to exert his influence to pacify the anger of the existing wife of the hero

against his secret love- affair although he has a soft corner for the king and his lover in their love- affair. To smooth the path of the union of the hero and heroine he hands over the precious necklace to Cārudatta and finally carries it to Vasantasenā and in this way plays the role as an assistant of the hero in love.

In Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa the Vidūṣaka Vasantaka plays a different role. The Vidūṣaka has been engaged here primarily to collect informations about the captivated king and to assist the Minister Yougandharāyaṇa in his plan to rescue the king from the prison of Mahāsen. Presentation of fun and humour by him is totally secondary here. There are two major important roles of the Vidūṣaka i.e. creating fun and amusement for the audience and secondly to act as the confidant of the hero in love and Vasantaka here performs neither of these two roles. Vasantaka here has not the slightest touch with the king in favour of his love- affair. On the contrary he opposes the king's love affair in captivity. In fact Vasantaka in this play is an incomplete creation of Bhāsa. When Santuṣṭa is so loyal and faithful to his royal friend Avimāraka that he is agreeable to be his assistant in his next life also, Vasantaka intends to leave the king when he is in danger.

But in Svapnavāsavadattam we get more matured Vidūṣaka. His humour and amiable personality make his character enjoyable to us. In this play the queen Vāsavadattā is believed to be dead. Neither the king nor the Vidūṣaka Vasantaka knows that she is still alive and that her death news is a trick of the Minister Yaugandharāyaṇa who propagates the same with a view to arranging marriage of Udayana and

Padmāvatī, who is deeply infatuated with Udayana and Vāsavadattā herself is a party of this plan of Yaugandharāyaṇa. So Vasantaka has nothing to do for the union of Udayana and Padmāvatī. Bhāsa has not given him the least opportunity to play this role because he appears on the stage after the marriage of Udayana and Padmāvatī. Vāsavadattā herself wants that the king Udayana marries Padmāvatī and so she plays a positive role in the preparation of the background for their marriage. Vasantaka is neither to act as a confidant of the King in love facing strong opposition of the existing queen nor he is required to appease the angry queen to pave the way for the happy union of the hero and his lover.

Of all the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa, Santuṣṭa occupies the predominant position. He is not the subject of ridicule by others like Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. Here Vasantaka appears as a mere clown. He fails to satisfy the audience as a Vidūṣaka possessing his essential qualifications. But Santuṣṭa is opposite. He is not a clown but a good source of fun, humour and amusement. His dialogue, behavior and relation with others create profuse fun for the audience.

But Maitreya in Cārudattam is totally different from other Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa. He does not present himself as a voracious glutton who is ever ready to get food at any cost like Santuṣṭa although sometimes he mentions some food staff. Neither he has become a source of much fun and amusement nor he has been ridiculed by others. Like Santuṣṭa he appears as an assistant of the hero, extremely loyal to his friend and unlike Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa he has no

intention to desert his friend at the time of his distress or crisis. All through the play Maitreya appears to be a very timid person. He reveals something feminine trait in his character. He dares not go outside the house in darkness alone and feels safe to do so accompanied by a maid-servant.

Sometimes the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa appear to be redundant. The example of Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa may be cited here. It is not clear for what exact purpose Bhāsa incorporated Vasantaka here. Here we see Vasantaka not as a Vidūṣaka in true sense but as a detective who is employed to collect the information of the captivated King in the guise of a beggar. To engage one shabby beggar to collect information about a person who is a king and who is imprisoned in the jail of his enemy is how far wise and justified is a matter of much deliberation. From the version of Vasantaka we come to know that he meets Udayana, the King of Vatsa in his captivity. The King detains him for long and discusses with him that he is hatching over the plan of wrecking vengeance upon Mahāsen, the king of Avantī and this is the sole reason why he is trying to make love with Vāsavadattā, Mahāsen's daughter. Now, how a beggar can manage to go to the place where the most dangerous enemy of the captor is imprisoned in tight security and to indulge in a discussion with the prisoner regarding his secret plan against the captor himself is a vital question. So his presentation in this play, so far as I think, is not a judicious decision of Bhāsa. His presence in the play does not serve good humour at all. To say preciously, he appears on the stage

in the guise of a beggar lamenting for some 'modaka', starts running after a madman to recover the 'modaka' but fails in his attempt and at last gets back the 'modaka' owing to the interference of Śramaṇaka. Does this scene produce fun and humour for the audience at all? Certainly not. So Vasantaka is not a source of humour for the audience. Rather he himself is a subject of ridicule by others which may create slight touch of smile in the lips of the audience but it is not expected by the audience of good taste at large. They expect pellucid humour and fun from the Vidūṣakas served by their appearance, gesture, witty dialogue etc. They do not favour raw, crude, vulgar, unpolished, immature waggery from them. The presence of Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa does not serve a good purpose as a Vidūṣaka. In fact Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa with Vasantaka and Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa without Vasantaka make no difference in the theatrical logicality of the play. He has been incorporated in the play like a parenthetic clause the removal of which does not hamper the meaning of the sentence. One may put a question. What purpose does Vasantaka serve in the play excepting bringing the information to the Minister Yaugandharāyaṇa that the King is well in his captivity and that he has indulged in love with the daughter of his enemy? The answer is perhaps nil although the above informations bear a significant importance in the course of the events of the play. Yaugandharāyaṇa and others do everything in the play what is needed to release the King from captivity which is the main activity of the play and the engagement of a Vidūṣaka to serve

this purpose is not necessary. Any loyal employee of the royal court having a detective mind can serve this purpose and probably in better manner. Nāṭyaśāstra does not support this role of Vidūṣaka. Perhaps Bhāsa did not agree to follow the direction of Nāṭyaśāstra in toto. He had his own theory. In fact Vasantaka has no scope to perform his required role in this play in obedience to the dictum of Nāṭyaśāstra. Bhāsa perhaps, if he projected him as a Vidūṣaka, incorporated him in this play for the sake of convention and as the story of the play does not provide any scope to him to play his original and normal role as per the theory of Nāṭyaśāstra, he is to remain satisfied with performing the role of a detective and making some dry attempt of creating fun for custom's sake.

As discussed above, a beggar will be able to reach the King in his captivity and will involve in secret discussion is not at all credible. It may be possible for a skilful detective in the guise of a lunatic beggar to overhear some secret discussions of some people of the area regarding this in some open public place. It is nothing but a far-fetched imagination of Bhāsa, of course if Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa is at all written by Bhāsa. Most probably this play is not written by Bhāsa. Long after its creation some perhaps took the play for granted to be written by Bhāsa and attempted to stamp Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa as Vidūṣaka. It is very difficult to believe or accept that Bhāsa who created the Vidūṣaka like Santuṣṭa will create such an incomplete Vidūṣaka as Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. And if it be the creation of Bhāsa it can be opined that Bhāsa did not present Vasantaka in this

play as a Vidūṣaka. Bhāsa perhaps presented him as a detective and quite naturally to make his job easy he placed him in the guise of a mad and shabby beggar so that other people of the enemy-country could not recognize him as a detective. Besides, there is another example in this play which strongly indicates that Vasantaka is a detective and not a Vidūṣaka. Santuṣṭa the most brilliant Vidūṣaka of Bhāsa is agreeable to wait for the King till his next life if he does not find him out in his present life. But Vasantaka just after bringing the information about the captivated King becomes anxious to leave the place deserting the condition of King. He tells Yaugandharāyaṇa that he will have to wait till his old age to see that the king is rescued.[51] This statement of Vasantaka amply establishes that he is a detective, not a Vidūṣaka. In every walk of life, every person or character must have some assigned duty and when that assigned duty is performed by him properly, necessity of his presence there ends. So Vasantaka's intention of leaving the place at that time as a detective is quite justified because he has performed his assigned duty properly and when Yaugandharāyaṇa asks him to collect some more informations about the King he gladly accepts it. He has immense deficit as a Vidūṣaka but as a perfect detective he is befitting in all points. So it will be appropriate and logical if we recognize Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa not as a Vidūṣaka but as a skilful and duteous detective because the mere presence of a touch of strained humour in a character like this Vasantaka is not

51 एव्वं एव् जरं गमिस्सामो Act-III

sufficient to crown him Vidūṣaka. In this context we may remember a famous line of a famous hindi Dnohā that states if one can become an ascetic only because he consumes fruits, then there are so many monkeys in the world.

The Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa are of very simple nature. In most cases their fun making quality is of poor standard. Sometimes it is vulgar. As for example, in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa Vasantaka ventured to create fun comparing the smell of his breath to that of the wind passing from the urinary bladder of a swine. What can be more vulgar than this on a stage?

Santuṣṭa, unlike other Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa, reveals his inferior taste in his dealings with the maid-servants. The manner in which he indulges in frivolous banter with the Ceṭī i.e. the maid-servants vis-a-vis the dealings of the maid-servants with him bring forth one question of probable fishy relation of Santuṣṭa and the Ceṭī.

In Svapnavāsavadattam Vasantaka is more matured as a Vidūṣaka. Here he proves himself as a true assistant of the King with whom he has a very cordial relation. When the King's mind becomes heavy with the painful remembrance of his first wife, Vasantaka, as a true assistant consoles him. When the King feels drowsy and wants to hear some story from Vasantaka, he, with a view to lulling the King to sleep, tells stories to him in a funny manner mentioning 'Kāmpilya' as 'king' and 'Brahmadutta' a 'city.'[52] What a sweet relation with

52 अत्थि णअरं वम्हदत्तं णाम । तहिं किल राआ कंपिल्लो णाम ।
Act—V

the King! Throughout the play he plays a polished, sweet, polite and amiable role and the audience enjoys his role as a Vidūṣaka much although, as discussed earlier, he has not the scope to play other important roles as Vidūṣaka i.e. to act as panderer of the erotic hero and his lover, to try to appease the angry existing queen etc. Yet he is more successful as a Vidūṣaka than Vasantaka of Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. We do not see him to indulge in frivolous bantering with the inferior persons like maid-servants, we do not see him to make himself a subject of ridicule to others. While presenting Vasantaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa, although some critics may disagree, is a futile attempt of Bhāsa to offer a Vidūṣaka for the audience, Vasantaka in Svapnavāsavadattam satisfies the expectations of the audience more. He has a definite role in the progress of the future course of actions of the play. It is he who creates ample opportunity for Vāsavadattā to understand the mentality of the King about her after his marriage with Padmāvatī and paves the way for happy, easy and trouble-free reunion of the King and Vāsavadattā. He insists the King on disclosing as to who between the earlier Vāsavadattā and the new Padmāvatī dearer to the King is[53] and the King's reply solves the most vital question of Vāsavadattā herself. It is not possible for anybody else excepting a Vidūṣaka to indulge in such type of discussion with the King or to attempt to lull him to sleep when he feels drowsy out of mental agony. He helps

53 का भवदो पिआ - तदाणिं तत्तहोदी वासवदत्ता, इदाणिं पदुमावती वा ? Act-IV

the King a lot to overcome different adverse situations with tact and remarkable presence of mind. Owing to his stupidity the reminiscence of Vāsavadattā floats on the canvas of the King's memory which tortures his mind with acute pain and brings tears in his eyes. Vasantaka goes to fetch water to wash King's face. On the way of his return he faces Padmāvatī who is eager to know the purpose of bringing water. Initially Vasantaka fumbles but quickly gives a tactful reply, "Pollen of Kāśa flower has fallen in the eyes of the King. So tears have come in his eyes. Hence I fetched the water to wash his face"[54] and offers the water to Padmāvatī to wash the King's face by her own hand. Padmāvatī believes it and compliments Vasantaka's generosity. The King feels uneasy to think within himself that Padmāvatī will be hurt if she hears the real secret behind Vasantaka's fetching the water because he perhaps thinks that if he remains any more in the company of Padmāvatī he may not be able to suppress the said secret from her because, as he thinks, Padmāvatī, although modest by nature is fidget which is the normal characteristics of a female character. Vasantaka is able to quickly guess the psychological state of the King's mind and to give him relief from facing this awkward situation takes away the King outside on the plea that he has an appointment with the King of Magadha in the afternoon. To play this role is only possible for a true Vidūṣaka which Vasantaka can undoubtedly claim. Thus we see that the

54 भोदि ! वादणदेण कासकुसुमरेणुणा अक्खिणिपडिदेण सस्सुपादं खु तत्तहीदो मुहं I Act IV

imperfection which we notice in the presentation of Vidūṣaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa, is rectified in Svapnavāsavadattām. In fact Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa may be treated as the first part of Udayana play and Svapnavāsavadattā as its second part and it is the second part which contains true provision of Vidūṣaka if, of course, the writers of both the drams are same.

4. Kālidāsa's Treatment of the characters of Vidūṣakas : Goutama

(in Mālavikāgnimitram)

The creation of the character of Goutama—the Vidūṣaka in Mālavikāgnimitram is the unique achievement of Kālidāsa. In fact Goutama as a Vidūṣaka surpasses all other Vidūṣakas created so far because of his intelligence, personality, technique and skill. Truly speaking, he acts as a real 'Karmasaciva' of the king Agnimitra. He is a true confidant of the hero in love, a true friend, philosopher and guide of the king at least so far as the story of this play is concerned.

Agnimitra- the king of Vidiśā happens to have a look at the portrait of a beautiful maid – Mālavikā kept in the custody of Dhāriṇī - the chief queen of the king and immediately falls in love with her and gradually becomes impatient to win her. He obviously opens his mind before his companion Goutama who as a true confidant of the hero in love vows to dedicate himself whole-heartedly to assist the king to fulfill his mission in love. So he spreads the cobwebs of his secret plan so methodically, tactfully and skillfully leading the play towards an enjoyable and happy ending that he becomes the axis of the play. Nowhere in the play we witness the king to play an active role like a hero except at the very beginning of the play where he directs his Minister Bāhataka with proper masculinity to take effective steps to resort to military expedition against his rival king of Vidarbha. In the rest of the play he plays a timid role under the umbrella of his jester to win his beloved Mālavikā .

So it is Goutama who dominates the whole play with his subtle plan and policy of uniting the king and his beloved Mālavikā together. Thus in the 1st Act just after the advent of him on the stage we hear him murmuring the words that he has been ordered by the king to find out a way so that the king can see the beautiful maid whom he happened to see in a picture kept in the custody of the queen Dhāriṇī and Goutama is also acting accordingly.[55] When the king beholds him, he addresses him as minister of love affairs[56] and wants to know whether he is actively planning for the same. Goutama whisper in his ears something. As the play proceeds we can guess that the whispering is regarding his secret plan of involving the Parivrājikā in his plan of arranging a dance competition of the disciples of Gaṇadāsa and Haradutta in front of the king so that the king can see Mālavikā face to face and also engaging Bakulāvalikā - Mālavikā's friend to anyhow bring Mālavikā to the close reach of the king in the pleasure garden.

From here we begin to see Goutama's unique intelligence, wit, ability of creating humour, quality of satirizing others, authority of dominating over all others including the hero, power of fabricating subtle plan to lead the whole play alone towards climax and happy ending.

However, as a preplanning of Goutama, the dance competition is arranged and the Parivrājikā is appointed judge to maintain proper impartiality because, as argued by

55 आणत्तोम्हि त्तभवदा रण्णा । गोदम, चिनतेहि द्व उवाअं । जह मे जदिच्छादिट्ठप्पदिकिदी मालविआ पञ्चक्खदंसणा होदित्ति । मए अ तं तहा किदं दाव से णिवेदेमि । Act—I

56 Agnimitra---अयमपरः कार्यन्तरसचिवो स्मानुपस्तिः । Act –I

Goutama, neither the king nor his head-queen can be an impartial judge because Mālavikā, the disciple of Gaṇadāsa, is the protégé of the head-queen Dhāriṇī and Haradutta is the teacher of another contestant Irāvatī who is the King's second queen. Gaṇadāsa being senior in age gets the first opportunity to display the dancing art of his disciple Mālavikā. Thus Goutama like a highly efficient engineer leads the total course of the play from the very beginning through a single channel wiping out the least possibility that will stand in the way of his reaching the goal of his purpose successfully. Mālavikā starts displaying her art with a song sung by her. The king sees Mālavikā in flesh and blood which gladdens his heart and maddens his mind. Goutama explains to the king that through the song she is offering herself to the king.[57] Throughout the play he constantly incites the king towards Mālavikā and in true sense acts as the panderer of the hero and his lover. Just after her dance performance Mālavikā proceeds for departure. But the amorous thirst of the lustful king is not quenched at all. So his intention is to enjoy her association for sometime more. The clever Vidūṣaka smells his intention. So he hits upon a plan and prevents Mālavikā from going out addressing the Parivrājikā that he has detected some fault on their part and that is not worshipping the Brahmin before displaying their first performance.[58] This leads to some discussions and counter discussions for some time and thus the shrewd Vidūṣaka

57 भो वअस्स ! चउष्पवत्थअं दुवारीकरिअ तुह् उवट्ठाविदो अप्पा तत्तहोदिए । Act—II

58 पढमोवदेसदंसणे पढमं बम्हणस्स पूजा कादव्वा I सा णं वो विसुमरिदा । Act--II

manages to provide some extra time for his love-lorn companion to sip the loveliness of the beautiful maid Mālavikā for some time more. The king notices the beautiful smile in the face of the large-eyed Mālavikā which ignites the passion of the King for her. Now Goutama's secret purpose of arranging the dance competition is fulfilled and so Haradutta has no scope to avail his turn of displaying the dancing art of his disciple on that day. Just then Baitālika announces that it is noon and the glutton jester with a view to diverting the direction of the situation says that it is high time both for him and for the King to have lunch now. Referring medical science he says that the doctors do not approve taking food beyond proper time.[59] Here he reveals his gluttonous characteristics and requests the queen to arrange food and drink for them quickly. He says to the King that his stomach is burning like the furnace of a sweetmeat shop.[60] Whenever he gives some example he refers to foodstuff. As the King becomes impatient to win the beautiful maid, Goutama says to him that he is greedy but timid like the bird hovering on a slaughter house.[61] He knows very well that hastiness on the part of the King may spoil the entire plan. So he asks the King to keep patience to reach his goal. All these amply reveal that he is a very intelligent and wise fellow who assists and guides the King to

59 अविहा अविहा । अम्हाणं उण भोअणबेला उवट्ठिदा । अत्तभवदो उइदवेलादिक्कमे चिइच्छआ दोस उदाहरन्ति । Act-II

60 दिढम् विपणिकन्दू विअ मे हिअ अब्भन्तरं दज्फइ । Act-II

61 भवं वि सूणापरिसरचरो विअ गिद्धो आमिसलोलुओ भीरुओ अ । Act-I

fulfill his mission in love like a perfect 'Karmasaciva' to the King. Unlike the King he is very much cautious in his stepping. In Act III we see a highly funny and humorous situation. The Vidūṣaka along with the King as per his preplanning appears. He says to the King that he has successfully managed Bakulāvalikā who has given her word that although the queen Dhāriṇī has kept Mālavikā under strict watch and ward and it is too difficult to get her like the gem on the head of a snake, she will do what the King desires. Goutam proposes to the King to go to the pleasure garden as the queen Irāvatī wishes to swing with the King there on the occasion of spring festival. But the King is so much engrossed in the thought of Mālavikā that he does not agree to give company to his second queen. Here the Vidūṣaka shows his prudence and says to the king that it will not be proper to impair the courtesy in the zenana.[62] All through the play he, like a true guide, advises the King one after another to lead the King in proper direction. Before entering into the pleasure garden he again reminds the king to be relaxed and maintain patience.

A highly funny situation awaits them in the pleasure garden. Mālavikā in place of Irāvatī comes there anxiously. The jester's excitement bubbles. He compares Mālavikā to tasty food as a side dish of an intoxicant.[63] The King's excitement at the sight of Mālavikā overflows. The jester informs him that Bakulāvalikā whom he secretly engaged to manage Mālavikā

62 णरिहदि भवं अन्तेउरट्ठिदं दक्खिण्णं एक्कपदे पिट्ठदो कादुम् । Act-III

63 वअस्स, एदं क्खु सीहुपाणुव्वेजिदस्स मच्छण्डिआ उवणदा । Act-III

for the King is coming. The King is skeptical about whether she will at all keep his request in her mind. At this the Vidūṣaka leaves trace of one of his important characteristics i.e. abusiveness. He for nothing calls names Mālavikā by the words 'Dāsyaputrī' which means 'illegitimate child'. He, out of stupidity, declares himself as a 'dunce'. He says, "Why the Dāsyaputrī will forget your important matter? Even me also never forget this."[64] The Vidūṣaka along with the King is hiding behind the bower of creepers. They are totally in the dark that Queen Irāvatī along with her maid Nipuṇikā reaches there and are hiding themselves behind the creepers.

The King and the jester being rest assured about the absence of any other third party there, are watching Mālavikā performing 'Dohada' on behalf of the queen Dhāriṇī who could not come personally to perform the 'Dohada' because of an injury in her leg which was caused by some trick of Goutama himself and so entrusted the same to her protégé Mālavikā . All on a sudden the king and the jester appears before Mālavikā who startles and springs in awe and surprise. The king immediately starts chatting with Mālavikā. Irāvatī who is watching everything from her hiding place fails to restrain herself any more and almost jumps upon the king in anger and jealousy. The king is perplexed and seeks suggestion of the jester about what he should do now. The jester is also at a loss and suggests the King to run away. What a funny situation this is! Goutama insists the king to reply something in his defence

64 किं दाणिं एसा दासीए दुहिता तुह गुरुअं संदेसं विसुमरेदि । अहं दाव ण विसुमरेमि । Act-III

because even a burglar when caught red-handed claims that he has just started learning burglary.[65]

In the Act IV the king comes to know that Queen Dhāriṇī being informed about the secret relationship between the King and Mālavikā imprisoned her and ordered the female guard of the prison not to release Mālavikā and Bakulāvalikā unless and until her signet ring is shown to her. The king becomes hopeless and again the Vidūṣaka plays the role of the savior of the king. He devises a plan for the rescue of Mālavikā from the prison and whispers the same in the ear of the king and calls the king outside. Leaving that place the king goes to queen Dhāriṇī and starts chatting with her. In the meantime Goutama after pricking his thumb by a thorn of Ketakī imitating the sign of snake-bite tying the same by his sacred thread i.e. Jajñopbīta comes there in a bewildered manner feigning and uttering the words that he has been bitten by a snake in the pleasure garden when he went there to meet the Queen Dhāriṇī and touched the Aśoka tree.

At this superb acting queen becomes puzzled and the king orders for his medical treatment at once and sends him to the physician Dhruvasiddhi. Everything is going on as per the master-plan of the cunning jester who is feigning as if he is about to die. To make his acting perfectly credible, he exhibits the symptoms of snake-venom and requests the king in a highly plaintive voice to look after his age-old mother after his death and begs pardon to the Queen Dhāriṇī if he has committed any offence to her. What a superb acting! There is

65 उदआन्दमूले विवहिए विमहिदेण कुमभीलएण संधिच्छेदे सिक्खिदव्वो त्ति वत्तव्वं होदि । Act-III

not even a slightest scope to presume any touch of hypocrisy on the part of the jester. The Queen is totally befooled seeing the superb acting of Goutama. Next the jester plays another trick. Joysenā, the door-keeper, informs that the royal physician Dhruvasiddhi requires for the medical treatment of the jester something on which the image of snake is engraved. At once Queen Dhāriṇī without suspecting a little hands over her signet ring to the door-keeper and the said ring comes to the hand of Goutama who shows it to the female guard of prison and becomes successful to convince her about the release of Mālavikā and Bakulāvalikā. Cunningness to the highest degree is one of the important features of his character. Here also he shows his superb skill and intelligence. The female guard may suspect something if he pleads for the release of Mālavikā and Bakulāvalikā only. So he tells her that the king has ordered for release of all the prisoners to protect the king from the sinister look of a star as per opinion of an astrologer. What a subtle plan Goutama made! While describing this episode to the King, Goutama tells the king that although he is a dunce, he was capable of showing presence of mind at that time. He loves the King truly. The King also recognizes this and says, "Friend! you truly love me."[66] His plan as well as duty to the King does not end here. He is to arrange a secret meeting of the king with Mālavikā . So he keeps Mālavikā in the Samudragṛha and brings the King there. Here a highly funny situation for the audience but an extremely embarrassing position for the king takes place and Goutama's

66 सखे, प्रियो हं खलु तव । Act-IV

stupidity is responsible for this. The King indulges in chatting with Mālavikā in the Samudragṛha. To leave them in solitude Goutama takes Bakulāvalikā out of the Samudragṛha on some plea of chasing away one fawn that is eating sprouts of Aśoka plant. Thus he assists the king very tactfully paving the way for the king to meet his fiancé Mālavikā alone in private.

However, he can not maintain his skill of devising flawless plan for the king till the end of the episode. After placing the king and Mālavikā in the Samudragṛha he posts himself as a door-keeper there. He is cock-sure that nobody else will come there. So feeling fully relaxed he immediately starts dozing sitting at the door of the Samudragṛha. In the meantime Irāvatī and Nipuṇikā arrive there. They hear Goutama talking in his slumber addressing Mālavikā to defeat Irāvatī which irritates them. Nipuṇikā reviles him as a 'scoundrel imposter' because after consuming so much sweetmeat of the royal house, now he is favouring Mālavikā. Here we get proof of Goutama's cowardice. Being too much irritated, Nipuṇikā with a view to frightening Goutama, throws a crooked stick on him and he is startled and springs up in utter fear mistaking it to be a serpentine. But he has also the superb quality of tackling an adverse situation. So quickly he mends his mistake and says, "Oh! It is a stick.[68] Hearing some noise outside both the King and Nipuṇikā come out of the Samudragṛha to the surprise of all present there. Both the king and the jester is puzzled. The jester makes a soliloquy, "What a

67 बउलावलिए, एसो बालासोअरुक्खमूस पलूलवाइं लङ्घेदि हरिणो एहि णिवारेम णं IAct-IV

68 (सप्रहासम्) कहं दण्डकट्ठ एदं I Act-IV

nuisance ! A free house-pigeon is fallen in the clutches of a cat."[69] The king fidgets to find a way out to overcome the embarrassing situation and seeks the jester's help. The Vidūṣaka in spite of his powerful presence of mind and intelligence is equally at a loss and is unable to help him at this stage. But they are fortunate enough that suddenly Joysenā brings the information that the princes has become fainted seeing a tawny monkey while running behind a ball. Immediately everybody becomes busy for the princes and this situation hushes up. Goutama calls the monkey, their savior, as his 'Svapakṣa'[70] which indicates that he has a monkey-like appearance. The whole plan was going to be spoiled owing to his stupidity.

The entire incident narrated above amply establishes that Goutama plays the most dominant role in the drama. If the word 'hero' is defined as a person who dominates the whole play, it is undoubtedly Goutama who can claim the recognition as the real hero of the play. In fact the claim of Agnimitra as hero of this play becomes blurred owing to the dominance of Goutama all through the play. He remains always by the side of the king like his shadow and renders all possible assistance to him to overcome the adverse situations. In Act-V when after getting Mālavikā the king feels utter coyness and can not understand what to say and queen Dhāriṇī puts question to him whether the king is neglecting her but the king yet fails to

69 (आत्मगतम् I) अहो, अणत्थो संपडिदो I बन्धणब्भट्टो गिहकवोदो विडालिआए आलोए पडिदो I Act-IV

70 साहु रे साहु पिङ्गलवाणर, साहु I परित्तादो तुए सपक्खो I Act-IV

say anything, it is Goutama who comes forward and relieves the king saying "Every new bridegroom is shy."[71] This and many other examples mentioned above clearly indicate how ready-witted and extemporaneous Goutama is. Of course it is not true that his skill has no limitation. Although he leaves no stone unturned to successfully establish himself as a highly skillful 'karmasaciva', his plan sometimes fails and hence he along with the king and Mālavikā is caught red-handed by Irāvatī and her maid-servant in the Samudragṛha.

At length it may be said that Goutama is the superb creation of Kālidāsa. No other Vidūṣaka could show so much brilliance, ingenuity, agility etc. although there remains a question how far the portrayal of the character of Goutama abides by the theatrical grammar.

71 भोदि, एसो लोअव्ववहारो I सव्वो णववरो लज्जादुरो होदि त्ति I Act-V

MĀṆAVAKA

(in Vikramorvaśīyam)

In Vikramorbaśīyam the character of the Vidūṣaka bears the essential qualifications which are prescribed by Bharata, Śāradatanaya etc. But the prescription that his name should bear the resemblance with that of flower, season etc. has not been followed here.

In this drama his name is Māṇavaka which means a deformed man. He belongs to Brahmin community and is greedy, a glutton, an easy prey of deception by others, queer-looking and is a companion in love of the Hero. His presence on the stage creates profuse fun. We see him first at the very beginning of Act II where we see him sitting quietly in the secluded palace waiting for his companion King Purūravas. Just then the Ceṭī Nipuṇikā being predetermined to deceive him appears on the stage and seeing him in that condition describes him to be like a tawny monkey drawn in a picture.[72] From this it is revealed here that Māṇavaka has a monkey-like appearance. He himself is well-aware of his ugly appearance. He asks the king, "Is the Hon'ble Urvaśī unparalleled in beauty as I am unparalleled in ugliness?"[73] When the king asks his son to salute his dear friend Māṇavaka without any fear, he says, "What is the cause of apprehension? He is well acquainted with monkey because of his living in Āśrama."[74] Māṇavaka is

72. एसो आलेक्खवाणरो विअ किंपि तुण्हिं भूदो अजजमाणवओ चिट्ठदि I Act-II
73. किंतथ्थभोदी उव्वसी अदुद्दिआ रूवेण, अहं वि अ विरुवदाए I Act-II
74. किं ति संकिस्सदि I अस्समवासपरिचिदो एव्व साहामिओ I Act--V

too simple and foolish. He is not capable of holding anything secret for long and discloses it easily at the slightest flattery by the others. Quite expectedly being the dearest companion of the hero in love he is fully aware of the secret love episode of his friend King Purūravas with the Apsarā Urvaśī. He also knows it very well that the King wants to keep the matter secret particularly from the queen who must have got some smell of positive suspicion that something fishy is going on between the King and some unknown woman whose name she wants to know and hence the Ceṭī Nipuṇikā is engaged by her to collect the information and Nipuṇikā targets the foolish Māṇavaka for this purpose and Māṇavaka becomes an easy prey to her. So when Nipuṇikā – the appropriate named Ceṭī spreads very tactfully a trap of false information that the King happened to address the Queen Aisinarī telling the name of that very woman for whom the King is very anxious, Māṇavaka instantly and without being able to feel slightest doubt about the genuineness of the statement of Nipuṇikā, discloses the name of Urvaśī. "Has he called the Queen taking the name of Urvaśī?[75]"-he says. He also adds, "The king after seeing her (Urvaśī) has been giving agony not only to the Queen, but to him (Māṇavaka) also[76] and the purpose of Nipuṇikā becomes amply successful as she planned. What a great fool Māṇavaka is! The King himself knows very well that he is a great fool.

75 किं आमंतिदा तथ्थभोदी उव्वसि त्ति I Act-II

76 ताव दंसणेण उम्मादिदो तथ्थभवं ण केवलं तथ्थभोदीं, मं पि विणोदविमुहो किं आमंतिदा तथ्थभोदी उव्वसि ताव दंसणेण उम्मादिदो तथ्थभवं ण केवलं तथ्थभोदीं, मं पि विणोदविमुहो दढम् पीडेदि I Act-II

When Māṇavaka fails to give back the birch leaf to the King, the latter comments with annoyance, "A fool commits mistake everywhere.[77]" When the king returns and asks him whether he was able to maintain secrecy about his love episode, he quickly understands that he has been deceived by the Ceṭī[78] and bluffs the king to suppress the fact just like a truant boy who after leaving school and being crossed-examined by his guardians attempts to suppress it by saying this or that. Thus in this way Māṇavaka presents profuse humour to the audience at the very beginning of the Act.

Extreme attraction for food is another important feature of his character. The King himself has well adorned (!) him with this qualification. When the King being infatuated describes the beauty of the East under the dim light of the rising Moon, Māṇavaka, a man devoid of the capacity of appreciating the same, compares the Moon to a piece of a broken sweetmeat[79] and the king smilingly attributes him the qualification glorious (!) for him, "Glutton's world always revolves round the thought of food."[80] The queen notices some physical and mental change coming over the king and suspects that it is due to some secret love- affair of the king. But Māṇavaka tells her that it is due to his upset bile and requests her to bring some foodstuff quickly for the king.[81] When the

77 राजा--- सर्वत्र प्रमादी वैधेयः I Act—II

78 अदिसंधिदोम्हि दासीए I अण्णधा ण वअस्सो एव्वं पुच्छदि I Act-II

79 ही ही भो, एसो खंडमोदअसस्सिरीओ उदिदो राआ दुआदीणं I Act—III

80 राजा---- सर्वत्रोदरिकस्याभ्यवहार्यमेव विषयः I Act–III

81 भोदि, तुवरेहि से भोअणं जं पित्तोवसमणसमथ्थं भोदि I Act-II

king being afflicted with the thought of separation from Urvaśī, states that the amenities of life like a bed fully covered with petals of flowers, the pleasant stainless light of the moon, the fragrant sandal and the smearing of it on the whole body, even the necklace of pearls and gems etc. can not relieve his mental agony. Māṇavaka, without being able to understand the depth of the concern of the king, says, "When I do not get curd and mango mixed with sugar and spice, I console myself praying for and praising the same.[82] That means extreme fondness for food is inherent in his character. When the queen comes to the king with the necessary materials of worship, Māṇavaka remarks, "Don't know whether (the queen) would give the articles of 'Svastivacan i.e. sweetmeat." When the queen asks the king to bear with her request for sometime because she intends to perform some ritual in presence of the King, Māṇavaka comments, "May this type of request with such Svastivācanik (food) materials come frequently!" When the queen offers the sweet balls to him he graciously showers blessings on her. Citralekhā asks the king to see it carefully that Urvaśī does not become impatient for heaven when she (Citralekhā) will worship the god Sun in summer after spring. Immediately Māṇavaka counters her saying, "What is there in Heaven to remember? There is neither food nor drink."[83] To him even the Heavenly bliss is inferior to his fondness for food and loveliest place to him is the kitchen. This is revealed when

82 अहं पि जदा सिहरिणि रसालं च ण लहे तदा णं प्थ्थअंतो संकओअंतो आसासेमि I Act—III

83 कि वा सग्गे सुमरिदव्वं I ण तथ्थ खादिअदि ण पीअदि I केवलं अणिमिसेह अच्छीहि मी णदा अवलंवीअदि I Act—III

we see that when the love-lorn king seeks some suggestion from his nearest companion i.e. the Vidūṣaka about where he should go now with a view to getting some mental consolation, he in no time suggests the name of kitchen because there he will be able to reduce tension to some extent seeing various types of food stuff.[84] When the king is thrilled to go through the love letter of Urvaśī, he like a man devoid of finer sense says, "It is a good luck that at the time of appetite I have got 'Svastivacana' and you got the consolation.[85]" The birch leaf lost from the custody of the fool Māṇavaka comes to the hand of the queen who after getting it read by her Ceṭī Nipuṇikā becomes annoyed with the king and after some seemingly altercation with him leaves the place with her Ceṭī although the king confesses his guilt and prostrating on her feet tries to appease her. The king expresses his annoyance to the incident and decides to adopt patience (indifference) to her, Māṇavaka promptly replies, "Hang your patience. Now save the life of the hungry Brahmin. It is proper time for you for bathing and taking food."[86] All these mean that a strong thought of managing food moves about constantly in his brain day in and day out. He is an all out glutton.

Māṇavaka is afraid of snakes. When Urvaśī drops the love letter for the king, Māṇavaka suddenly cries out loudly, "Help! Help! Something like the slough of a snake fell in front

84 तहि पंचविहस्स अव्भवहारस्स उवणदसंभारस्स जोअणं पेक्खमाणेहि सक्कं उक्कंठा विणोदेदुं I Act-II

85 दिट्ठिया मए विअ वुभुक्खिदेण सोत्थिथवाआणं उवलद्धं भवदा समासासणं I Act--II

86 चिट्ठदु दाव भवदो धीरदा I वुभुक्खिदस्स वम्हणस्स जीविदं अवलंवदु भवं I समओ क्खु देण्हाणभोअणं सेवतुिम I Act-II

us."[87] He lacks natural masculine personality so much that even the maid-servant of the queen succeeds to deceive him in extracting from him the secret information of the love episode of the king with the Apsarā Urvaśī like a drop of water falling from the blade of grass using a most trifling trick.

He leaves traces of his foolishness in many places. His first folly is to disclose the love episode of the king to the queen's maid. Secondly he loses the love letter of Urvaśī which the King handed over to him in good faith for safe custody. He gives foolish bluffs regarding this one after another. When the King asks him to show the letter, he says that perhaps it has followed the path of its writer Urvaśī.

He lacks some finer sense to enter deep into a situation. When the queen in utter dissatisfaction owing to the love letter of Urvaśī, leaves the King leaving a pale shadow on the King's face, he fails to understand the gravity of the situation and passes the comment, "It has become favourable to you. Light of candle does not suit an optical patient.[88]" The King does not judge the situation in this manner because although he is in love with Urvaśī, he loves and respects the queen as before. The love letter of Urvaśī comes to the hand of the queen solely owing to the foolishness of Māṇavaka leaving the king in an awkward and shameful situation and the King seeks confidentially his advice as to what should be his duty now, Māṇavaka although being his most trusted companion compares him to a thief caught red handed. When the queen

87 अविहा अविहा भो, किं णु क्खु एदं भुअंगणम्मिोअअं विअ संमुहे णो णिवडिदं I Act—II

88 अणुऊलं एत्थ भवदो एदं I ण हु अक्खिदुक्खिदो अहिमुहे दीवसिहं सहेदि I Act—II

after performing the ritual praying for the union of the King with Urvaśī and vowing for maintaining a cordial relation with the fiancé of the King, leaves the king with a heavy heart making the situation grave, Māṇavaka says to the King, "As a physician deserts a patient suffering from an incurable disease, so the queen relieved you."[89] He takes everything lightly without comprehending its gravity. He lacks seriousness. Although the King is in secret love with the Apsarā Urvaśī, these types of shallow comments must not have soothing effect on the love-lorn heart of the King.

He can not help the King a little in the fulfillment of his mission in love. On the contrary he consciously or unconsciously plays a negative role in the love affair of the King. On the one hand he discloses the name of the fiancé to Nipuṇikā and thereby creates a strong obstacle in the way of fulfillment of the king's purpose. On the other hand he gives his consent to be in the queen's side in this regard and vows that he will try his best to dissuade the King from the attraction of the Apsarā and only after that he will meet the queen. This is unusual for the character of Vidūṣaka. He describes the eagerness of the king for Urvaśī as the desire of a Cātaka (a type of flying bird that drinks rain water only while flying) craving for the drops of rain from the sky.[90] As a way out of availing the King's object of love he gives a bogus suggestion to the King to either go to sleep so that his lover comes to him in his dream or

89 असज्झो त्ति परिछिदिअ आदुरो विअ वेज्जेण अइरेण मुक्को तथ्थभवं भोदिए I Act—III

90 अदो क्खु भवदा दिव्वरसाहिलासिणा चादअव्वदं गहिदं I Act-II

to draw a portrait of Urvaśī and to stare at the same.[91] This is not the role of a Vidūṣaka who is a companion in love of the hero.

Although he has no capacity to render positive help and assistance to the King in his love affairs, some positive points of his character at times peep through some of his conversations. Sometimes he gives some advices to the King which may not be valueless although those are not of higher quality and he may have some other intentions behind them. When Urvaśī leaves the King first and the King suffers from immense mental disturbances, Māṇavaka says to the King, "Please do not affect your health." Although he gives this advice to the King to somehow suppress his inability to show the love letter to the King, yet in greater sense it bears a deeper meaning. Purūravas is a king. He has the responsibility to rule his kingdom and if he spoils his health running madly only after his fiancé, his subjects will suffer a lot. So this advice of Māṇavaka bears a high practical value. When the King is highly afflicted with the reminiscences of Urvaśī, the queen is seen to come towards him. Then Māṇavaka like a prudent man advises him to maintain self-restraint of speech because the king wants to conceal his love episode and much unnecessary and useless talks may lead to disclosure of some clues of the secret matter. When the queen explains to the King the purpose of the ritual to be performed by her and the King raises counter question regarding the utility of performing the said ritual,

91 सिविणसमाअमआरिणि निद्दं सेवदु भवं I अहवा तथ्थभोदिए उव्वसीए पडिकिदिं अलिहिअ ओलोअंतो चिट्ठ I Act—II

Māṇavaka dissuades him saying, "Please refrain from saying so. Well spoken words should not be refused."[92] It may be that he dissuades the King mid-way and tells him these words owing to his apprehension that if the queen stops performing the ritual, he will be deprived of his legitimate share of the sweet balls. But it has some deeper meaning too. If one can follow this principle in ones practical life, one can easily overcome many of the troubles of life and it is truly applicable in the case of the King too. When the vulture flies away with the gems which is highly favourite to the King, everyone including the King become highly worried and restless to recover it, Māṇavaka like a true adviser advises him to have patience and take rest because the king has many other men to perform the job and a prudent man should hold patience when problem comes. His other advices to the King are, "Don't strive to find out all the characteristics of earthly ladies in the Apsarās"[93] and "Who can analyze the mysteries of gods with proper justification[94]?" It is beneficial for the King to follow these advices because it is of no use for the King to run behind a hallucination because the whole kingdom is dependent on him. He reminds Royal duties to the King. The King is perplexed about his duty when the vulture flies away with his favourite gems, Māṇavaka advises him, "There is no question of detest here. Offender should be punished."[95] Some critics may say

92 ण जुत्तं सुहासिदं पच्चाखादुं I Act—III

93 मा भवं स्ववं्वं माणुसीधम्मं दविवासु संभावेदु I पभावगूढाइं ताणं चरदिाइं I Act—V

94 को देवदारहस्साइं तक्कइस्सदि I Act-V

95 भो, अलं एथ्थ घिणाए I अवराही सासणीओ I Act—V

that he said this only to please the King. But this is the real Royal duty which a King must obey without discrimination and it is Māṇavaka-the Vidūṣaka, who being the true assistant of the king does not forget to remind the king of this at the appropriate time.

He has some sense of beauty and power of description of beautiful things. He can use good simile also. As the queen being highly offended on the King after getting the birch leaf containing the love letter, leaves the King along with her companions, Māṇavaka describes her departure, "The displeased queen left the place like the river of rainy season."[96]

He also gives some proof of his sense of dignity which his community is due to get as a custom. As Urvaśī shakes off the 'tiraskaraṇī' (a magical device to become invisible) and becomes visible to the King who holding her hand makes her sit there and Urvaśī omits to salute Māṇavaka, the usual sense of dignity of Brahmanhood arises in the mind of Māṇavaka and he says to Urvaśī affectionately, "You did not show reverence to the Brahmin-the favourite companion of the King."[97]

Usually a Vidūṣaka himself becomes an object of laugh and caricature to others because of his queer appearance, irrelevant talks and activities and Māṇavaka is no exception. But that he can cut jokes to others is seen in Māṇavaka when the King wants to know from him the reason of Urvaśī behind her intention of hiding her son and he promptly replies, "Lest the king should desert her considering her age-old."

96 पाउसणदी विअ अप्पसण्णा गदा देवी I Act—II

97 भोदि, रण्णो पिअवअस्सो वम्हणो किं ण वंदीअदि I Act—II

But sometimes Māṇavaka can give proof of some keen insight. When after the reunion of Urvaśī and her son tears come in her eyes, Māṇavaka does not miss to notice it. He can easily comprehend that the tears in her eyes are not due to her expression of joy for getting her son. Rather it is due to the acute pain of her heart for her imminent separation from the king Purūravas because as per previous order of Indra- the King of gods she must go back to Indra as soon as she sees the face of her son. Now he can understand that the separation from Urvaśī will instill so much unbearable pain in the heart of the king Purūravas that he will surely start for the Tapovana wearing the dress of the ascetics. [98]

Thus we can enjoy the character Māṇavaka as a Vidūṣaka with his moderate jestings, innocent simplicity, gluttonous outlook, deficient presence of mind and sweet intimacy with the King.

98 संपदं तक्केमि तत्थभवदा वक्क्लं गेणहिअ तवोवणं गंतव्वं ति I Act—V

MĀḌHAVYA

(in Abhijñānaśakuntalam)

In obedience to the prescription of poetics Kālidāsa has kept the name of the Vidūṣaka in his famous drama Abhijñānaśakuntalam as Māḍhavya which bears an analogy with the name of Spring season. But there are differences of opinion among the critics behind the acceptability of the argument regarding the resemblance of the meaning of the name Māḍhavya with Spring season. In their opinion Kālidāsa did never follow the dictum of keeping the names of his Vidūṣakas after the names of flowers, seasons etc. It is nothing but a far-fetched imagination of some critics to detect an analogy between the names of Māḍhavya and the Spring season. However, the portrayal of the character of Vidūṣaka in this drama signifies the successful culmination of the dramatic genius of the great poet Kālidāsa. A subtle balance of the presentation of comedy as well as its dramatic necessity has been properly maintained in this drama.

In this drama we see the Vidūṣaka first at the very beginning of Act-II. Immediately after entering into the stage he heaves a deep sigh and starts lamenting over his misfortune. Normally the Vidūṣakas are well accustomed to a comfortable life in the houses of the Hero who is a King, a nobleman with profuse rest, food etc. He is in the habit of passing the days lightly as a close assistant of the hero making profuse fun and caricature for the people and the hero- in- love and sometimes assisting him in the fulfillment of his purpose in

love. He is neither required to exercise his brain to take part in the main activity of the court, nor is he required to render much physical labour to fulfill his purpose for earning his livelihood. In a word unlike all other members of the court and the citizens of the kingdom he relishes an extremely idle life so far as is seen in the dramas. But totally opposite has happened in his case here. As he enters into the stage lamenting over his ill luck we come to know that the King Duṣyanta has come to the forest for hunting and as is natural, Māḍhavya, his dearest companion, is compelled to accompany him. Here he is to sustain immense physical exhaustion to give his company to the King along with his hunting party. He laments that owing to his being a contemporary of the King in respect of age, he has become a victim of immense sufferings.[99] He is to wander constantly from one forest to another in search of deer, pigs, tigers etc. The water which he is to drink is collected from the hilly streams turned into bitter taste by decomposed leaves fallen into it. The food which is available is only the flesh of the hunted animals roasted in fire with the help of iron rods and that too in irregular hours. Owing to constant horse riding, the joints of the whole body have become full of pain. He can not sleep at night adequately and what is more troublesome is that the wretched bird-hunters who crawl in the forest at the time of hunting to frighten the birds and animals with their high uproar to drive them out from their hiding place, make him awake very early in the morning. So he has become very much impatient to leave the forest as early as he can. He has started

99 भो दिट्ठ एदस्स मअआसीलस्स रण्णो वअस्सभावेण णिविवणो मिह I Act-II

his effort to convince the king so that he leaves the forest and returns to the safe shelter of the castle. He has found out an intelligent trick. He sees the king coming encircled by the 'Javanīs' adorned with the garlands of wild flowers. Immediately he decides to stand leaning on his stick making his body crooked like a man of deformed body and he does so. The purpose of Vidūṣaka is to provide profuse fun and caricature for the audience and when he is seen standing in that peculiar pose the audience can not help bursting into loud laughter at their heart's content. However, standing in that manner he tells his companion i.e. the King that his limbs are not moving and so he is blessing the king only by words. The King laughs and wants to know the cause of the pain of his body. Māḍhavya puts a counter question to him bearing a symbolical meaning why the King asks for the cause of tears of eyes while he himself kicks in the eye.[100] As the King expresses his inability to follow this symbolical speech, Māḍhavya again puts a symbolical question and asks him if a cane on the bank of a river becomes bent like a hunchback whether it is due to his own pleasure or love or it is compelled to assume that shape owing to the force of river water.[101] Obviously Duṣyanta suggests the force of river water responsible for this. Māḍhavya replies that similarly it is the King himself who is responsible for this wretched condition of him. The King leaving behind his royal duty has adopted the profession of a hunter in this horrible place and as a result of running constantly after the wild animals the joints of his body have become loose and he (Māḍhavya) has lost control over his

100 कुदो किल सअं अच्छी आउलीकरिअि अस्सुकारणं पुच्छेसि I Act-II

101 जं वेदसो खुज्जशीलं वडिम्वेदि तं किं अत्तणो पहावेण, णं णइवेअस्स I Act—II

body. So he requests the King to take rest at least for one day. He condemns the King's hobby of hunting. But staring at the King he can easily guess that the King's mind is deeply engrossed in the thought of something else and so he (the King) turns his deaf ears to what Māḍhavya said so far. On hearing this remark from his friend the King declares gladly that he will refrain from hunting that day. At this Māḍhavya becomes highly glad, utters blessing for the King and attempts to leave the place. But the King dissuades him from going and asks him to render some help to him (the King) after taking rest and the glutton Vidūṣaka promptly wants to know whether it is for devouring 'modakas'- the sweet balls because he considers himself to be the fittest person in this regard.[102] This indicates another essential qualification of the character of Vidūṣaka i.e. extreme fondness for food. The King calls in his General and declares his decision. The General advocates in favour of the good effects of hunting. Māḍhavya becomes annoyed and scolds him outrightly for his too much passion for hunting. Māḍhavya needs not care much for the General because he is well aware of his position in the royal court. He is not a mere Vidūṣaka in the court ; he is as good as the younger brother of the King and by virtue of that position he has sufficient right to think for the well being of the king. He does not want that the extreme hardship of hunting affects the King's health, he does not want that the King neglects his subjects and does not like primarily that the King falls in love with an unknown hermit-girl who is supposed to be a Brahmin and not a 'kṣatriya'. He

102 किं मोदअखज्जिआए I तेण हि अअं सूगहीदो खणो I Act-II

describes the craze of the king for Śakuntalā as the longing of someone to eat tamarind after being reluctant to prolonged consumption of sweet dates only to get back the test of sweetness.[103]

The fact is that Māḍhavya has sufficient confidence in him that the King will not ignore him because the King favours him as his younger brother. This we find corroborated when we see that the King becomes agreeable to send him to the capital to represent him as an heir–apparent to respond to his mother's call. But to add to utter misfortune of Māḍhavya an unforeseen nuisance like a blister on the burn has engulfed the situation. The king while chasing a fawn during hunt happened to see a hermit-girl Śakuntalā in an hermitage and has fallen in love with her. So he is not at all thinking over returning to capital any more. Today also he spends a sleepless night brooding over her.

It is true that Māḍhavya at first does not accept the meeting of king Duṣyanta with Śakuntalā with a generous mind and describes the same as nuisance. It is perhaps due to his lack of information about the true identity of her. But he is a Vidūṣaka - a true companion of King in love. It is his duty to render all possible help to the King in achieving his goal in love and not to oppose his love- affairs totally without any rhyme or reason. So when he collects all information about her as well as hears the description of her divine beauty from the King himself, he in no time encourages the king to rescue her from

103 जह कस्स वि पिण्डखज्जुरेहिं उव्वेजिदस्स तिम्मिणिए अहिलासो भवे, तह इत्थिआरअणपरिभाविणो भवदो इअं अब्भत्थणा I Act-II

the Āśrama otherwise she may be compelled to be an unwilling match of a Tapasvī who has become bald-headed owing to constant application of 'iṅgudī' oil on the head.[104] But the manner in which he tells this bears a touch of subtle humour. The use of the words 'bald-headed Tapasvī' in this situation evokes laughter.

Here we do not see Māḍhavya as a mechanical Vidūṣaka only whose sole duty is to create fun and amusement by dint of his peculiar appearance, pose and posture and to help the hero to fulfill his mission in love.

In fact the King himself is highly skeptical about the ability of his Vidūṣaka as a dependable assistant in achieving his mission in love. Māḍhavya is garrulous by nature and the king apprehends that he may disclose the Śakuntalā episode before other queens in the royal house. So, when he decides to send Māḍhavya to the capital like an heir-apparent to pay honour to his mother's call, the King holding the hand of Māḍhavya says, "Dear friend! I am going to the Āśrama in honour of the appeal of the ascetics. Truly speaking, I have no attraction for that hermit-girl. Friend! Do not take it as true what I have told you jestingly."

The fun and humour created by Māḍhavya is full of modesty and wit. Nowhere it is vulgar, abusive or bears a touch of irony. His relation with the King and his family is highly soothing and affectionate. This aspect showers profusely from the entire conversation between him and the king. In fact this

104. तेण हि लहु परित्तंाअदु णं भवं I मा कस्स वि त वसिसणो इङ्गुदीतेल्लमिस्सचिक्कणसीससस्सस्स हत्थे पडिस्सदि I Act—II

quality of the character of Māḍhavya surpasses all the basic qualifications essential for the role of Vidūṣaka as prescribed by dramatic theorists.

Although Māḍhavya is highly reluctant about the king's passion for hunting and does not like his growing attraction for the hermit-girl at the initial stage, he does not lack sympathy for the King. The King's mother treats him as the younger brother of the King. Māḍhavya also does not disrespect it. Definitely he has a store of positive sympathy in his heart for the King. At the beginning he does not approve the King's attraction for Śakuntalā. But gradually he is able to understand that the King will be hurt if he continues to oppose it and so a deep sympathy glides from his heart for the King and he agrees to listen to the King's discussion regarding Śakuntalā patiently and finally gives his green signal, although jestingly, to accept that hermit-girl early. As the King sees the Abhijñāna ring offered by him to Śakuntalā in the hermitage and immediately gets back his reminiscence about Śakuntalā, deep pangs of conscience engulfs his heart and mind and becomes morose beyond description. At this, the heart of Māḍhavya becomes fully saturated with love and affection for the King. Duṣyanta asks Māḍhavya whether he too forgot everything about Śakuntalā, although he (the King) informed him something about her, Māḍhavya like a perfect near and dear one sympathizes with him and says, with a heavy heart that he did not forget it. But the king himself after telling everything about Śakuntalā asked him to keep silence over the

issue.[105] He always accompanies the King when an acute repentance for his inability to recognize his beloved Śakuntalā is tearing and smashing his heart. He is a 'friend in need is friend in deed' of the king who at this stage needs someone faithful and dependable to open his mind and relaxes his heavy heart by chatting with him regarding the situation and Māḍhavya plays this role very well. Once the King being extremely unable to endure the load of his mental agony considering himself accused of inflicting of sufferings on the innocent Śakuntalā, cries out in utter helplessness like a child, "Dear friend ! Rescue me," Māḍhavya's heart melts in endless affection and he consoles him saying, "My Lord! What are you doing? This behaviour does not befit you. Great men never becomes overwhelmed with grief. The lofty mountains do not tremble in high wind."[106] This indicates that his is a highly susceptible and sympathetic heart. When the King stares at the picture of Śakuntalā drawn by himself and plans to make some changes in the photograph for making her beauty more accurate and plausible, Māḍhavya like a nearest and dearest well wisher of him encourages him to do so early.

Māḍhavya is witty too. When the King wants to tell him about Śakuntalā and says, "Māḍhavya! Your eyesight is not fully satiated as yet because you did not behold someone who is really worth seeing," Māḍhavya is dead-sure that the King intends to tell about her because he is well ahead aware

105 ण विसुरमरामि I किं तु सव्वं कहिअ अवसाणे उण तुए परिहासविअप्पओ एसो ण भू दत्थो त्ति आचक्खिदं I मए वि मिपिण्डबुद्धिणा तह एव्वं गहीदं I अह वा भविदव्वदा क्खु बलवदी I

106 भो, किं एदं I अणुववण्णं क्खु ईदिसं तुइ I कदा वि सप्पुरसि सोअवत्तवा ण होन्ति I ण पवाडे वि णिकम्पा गिरीओ I Act-VI

of the attraction of the King for her. But the witty Vidūṣaka conceals his mind and gives a naughty smart reply, " Why my lord! You are in front of me."[107] As the King says that he wants to tell about Śakuntalā, Māḍhavya vows within himself, "Well, I shall not give him any scope" and pricks the King slightly saying, "My friend ! Then you are addicted to Tapasvīkanyā." Perhaps the king's face blushed at that moment. And it is a source of sweet enjoyment between them. While describing his first silent meeting with Śakuntalā the King informs Māḍhavya that she was feeling shaky, the witty jester says promptly, "She can not sit on your lap as soon as she beholds you."[108] In the Act-V the King tries to hear the beautiful song sung by one of his queen Haṃsapadikā, "Oh Bee ! You always want to relish the taste of new honey. After kissing the flowers of the mango tree and just after taking some rest sitting by the side of lotus, how could you forget it?" Māḍhavya does not want to miss the chance of pricking the king a little and perhaps with a naughty smile on his lips he says, "Could you understand the meaning of the words of the song?"[109] He is very much in the know of the formidable hobby of the King who does not feel satisfied with his queens of his harem only. He wants to embrace fresh ladies every now and then.

But whatever may be apparently his glaring side as Vidūṣaka, his character bears some touch of stupidity as some critics think. As the King says that he will scold the 'ring' holding the same responsible for his misfortune, Māḍhavya

107. णं भवं अग्गदो मे वट्टइ। Act-II

108. ण क्खु दिट्ठमेत्तस्स तुह अङ्कं समारोहदि I

109. किं दाव गीदीए अवगओ अक्खरत्थो?

calls it within himself as a madman's grief and according to the opinion of Prof. G. K. Bhāt it is a proof of his stupidity because he failed to assess the state of condition of the King's painful mind. But it may not be so and he rightly assessed the mental condition of the King at that situation which inevitably invites manifestation of some eccentric symptoms. After seeing the 'ring' the king gets back his reminiscences about his episode with Śakuntalā in the Tapovana (the hermitage). Now he can remember well that it is he who is responsible for her present unbearable plight. It is he who induced the innocent Tapasvīkanyā to marry him although he has some other queens also in his harem. It is he for whom she is going to be a mother and that poor innocent stainless Tapasvīkanyā shaking off all her prejudices, hesitation and womanly diffidence which are considered to be the most precious ornaments of a woman and who is one of the honorable queens of the royal house, herself comes to the capital crossing so long a distance on foot like a most ordinary woman and stands before the royal throne like a beggar for begging shelter in her husband's house with legitimate honour and dignity which is the traditional dream of all married women. But Alas! the King failed to recognize her. Although being much younger in age and perhaps not attaining the maturity and experience of a prudent woman, she tried to plead her best to enable the King to remember and recognize her but all her attempts were in vain. The King was unable to recognize and remember her and the ill-fated Śakuntalā had to leave the capital with heavy showers of tears in her eyes although her

companions who accompanied her in her journey refused to take her back because, as Māḍhavya thinks, the parents do not like to endure a divorced daughter well. After all, Duṣyanta is a King. It is his primary duty to do proper justice to all his subjects. And if he fails to render legitimate justice to his own wife, nothing can be more painful to an ideal King and all these thoughts invariably instill utter grief, repentance and sufferings in his heart which quite naturally generate some lunatic symptoms in his mind, behaviour, attitude and expressions. Māḍhavya assess all these correctly. So when the King proceeds to scold the 'ring," he takes it to be a mad man's behaviour and, so far as I think, he does not do so out of his sheer stupidity but as a result of his justified and prudent analysis of the situation. It is, in my opinion, neither stupidity nor sarcasm. Rather it is an immaculate soliloquy of a sympathetic heart for his dear companion. But in another occasion when the King asks him to suggest him an appropriate plea for going to the Tapovana, Māḍhavya really gives him a funny and stupid suggestion and tells him to go there to collect taxes.[110] A king is not required to go himself anywhere to collect taxes. Secondly, the attraction for Śakuntalā has maddened the heart and mind of the King. He is extremely eager and anxious to enter into the Āśrama with a view to seeking love of Śakuntalā, the Āśramakanyā and going there he will say, "I have come here to collect taxes." What a foolish, funny and stupid approach would it be for the King !

Māḍhavya has not the courage and personality to

110 को अवरो अवदेशो तुम राआणं I नीवारछट्ठभाअं अम्हाणं उवहरन्तु त्ति I Act-II

cope with the maids of the hārem and when the King decides to send him to his queen Haṃsapadikā, he apprehends that the queen will heckle him by her maids by pulling his sacred locks of hair and it is difficult for him to get rid of them easily.[111] He is a coward also. He is highly afraid of the demons. When the ascetics invites the King to go to Tapovana to protect the Āśrama from the attack of the demons and the king gladly accepts their proposal and asks Vidūṣaka whether he cherishes the desire in his mind to see Śakuntalā once, Vidūṣaka replies, "Previously I had the desire to see her. But after hearing about the demons the said desire has been volatilized."[112] But he leaves no stone unturned to try to make up the situation. When the King allows him to go back to the capital, he becomes very glad and says, "Of course do not think that I am afraid of the demons."[113] He is unable to give appropriate suggestion to the King at the time of necessity. The King's mind swings like a pendulum about what he should do- whether he will go back to the capital to respond to his mother's call or will go to Tapovana to perform his duty towards the ascetics and seeks Māḍhavya's suggestion, he says, "Stay like Triśaṅku" i.e . stay in the midway.[114]

Māḍhavya appears before us as an embodiment of pathos and spontaneous source of humour. No other Vidūṣaka

111 जं भवं आणवेदी I भो वअस्स गहीदस्स ताए परकीएहिं हत्थेहिं सहिण्डए ताडीअमाणस्स अच्छराए वीदराअस्स वअि
णत्थि दाणि मे मोक्खो I Act-V

112 पढमं सपरीवाहं आसी I दाणिं रक्खसवुत्तण्तेण विणुदु वि णाव ससिदो I Act-II

113 ण क्खु मं रक्खोभीरुअं गणेसि I Act-II

114 तिसङकू विअ अन्तरा चिट्ठ I Act-II

has been so successful like Māḍhavya to entertain the audience with his innocent fun and activity standing on such a tragic background.

Kālidāsa utilized the service of Goutama precisely for the necessity and duration for which he was required for the sake of dramatic event— neither more nor less. This is why he is sent back to the capital at the end of Act-II. Again we see his jiffy appearance at the beginning of Act-V when the king sends him to the apartment of Haṃsapadikā to appease her. We do not see him any more in that Act. But with our imaginative eyes we can still view him in the apartment of Haṃsapadikā encircled by her maid-servants who tease him pulling his sacred tuft of hair on the middle of his head. Kālidāsa is not so merciless as to make the humiliation of his most loving Vidūṣaka public. He leaves us permanently in Act-VI after being rescued by Duṣyanta from the clutches of Mātali who with a view to rousing heroic prowess in Duṣyanta attacks Māḍhavya in an invisible condition pulling his leg upward and head downward like the crushing of sugarcane in small parts and thereby providing a highly funny situation in the imaginative mind of the viewers. Only the heart-rending sound of the piteous cry of Māḍhavya for saving his life becomes audible to the viewers who giggle within themselves as they imagine the invisible plight of Māḍhavya as described by him and after being rescued by Duṣyanta he bids us adieu forever repleting the cup of our heart with unspeakable agony as we miss him in the scene of reunion of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā. But even long after the romantic modulation of the infatuating spell of the

dramatic sequence dies away, the audience as they, closing their eyelids, ruminate the pleasant reminiscence of Māḍhavya, can still see him standing before Duṣyanta leaning on his crooked stick with a sign of pain in his face and a giggling heart.

5. Comparison of the characters of the Vidūsakas of Kālidāsa with each other.

Kālidāsa has gifted us three remarkable characters of Vidūṣaka. They are Goutama in Mālavikāgnimitram, Māṇavaka in Vikramorbaśīyam and Māḍhavya in Abhijñānaśakuntalam. All of them bear close resemblance with each other. All of them belong to Brahmin community, all of them are Brāhmabandhu, all of them are glutton, lazy, ugly in shape and appearance. But this is their outward appearance only. They have some distinct differences too. Goutama is highly clever, adroit, inventive and possesses remarkable presence of mind. But his character is full of contradictions. He is at the same time highly intelligent and stupid, complicated and simple, highly tactful but ignorant. Māṇavaka possesses remarkable gift of the gab but is of crude in nature and is prone to commit mistake everywhere. Māḍhavya is full of simplicity and compassion and like Falstaff, is capable of producing laughter and amusement for the audience temporarily. The other glaring difference between Māṇavaka and Goutama is that while Goutama is remarkably successful to be the confidant of the hero in love and becomes his Karmasaciva and Narmasaciva par excellence and plays the role as a catalytic agent in the love affair of the King Agnimitra and Malavikā, Māṇavaka plays a negative role in the love affair of King Purūravas and Urvaśī . Goutama assists the King immensely in the fulfillment of his mission of love by dint of his superb intelligence and ingenuity. But Māṇavaka's role hampers the growth and development of the love affair of the King Purūravas and Urvaśī although he tries his best to wipe

out the mental stress of the king when he becomes morose regarding his love affair.

Kālidāsa portrayed the characters of his Vidūṣaka following the traditional way of Alaṁkāraśāstra but his outstanding genius instilled profuse strength in them by dint of which they could cross the dry barrier of convention and could leave a bright impression of originality in the world of Vidūṣaka. The pleasantness and elegance of the poetic imagination of Kālidāsa embellished his Vidūṣakas with excellent exaltedness. The flow of evolution of the character of Vidūṣaka that we look for starting from the Kāmaśāstra of Vatsāyana finds its culmination in the literature of Kālidāsa. We see that the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa are the denizens of this material world possessing the feelings of weal and woe of human life like the common people at large. But the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa, though they are the off-springs of this material world, roam in the mysterious firmament of infinity. The Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa are unparalleled in their immaculateness of imagination and pleasantness of character. A true analysis of the different traits of their character is not possible if they are fathomed by the same yardstick with all the Vidūṣakas in general. To have a clear idea about the different aspects of the characters of Kālidāsa's Vidūṣakas, they should be considered in the perspective of the whole works of Kālidāsa. The specialty of the style of humour of Kālidāsa lies in his equilibrium of mind and keen and deep sense of observation of life. Instead of satirising the follies and shortcomings of human life, he looked at them

with a generous affection and created pellucid humour through his Vidūṣakas. His Vidūṣakas are deformed, bald-headed and sharp-toothed. But at the touch of the magical wand of the wonderful genius of Kālidāsa they glow brilliantly in the light of novelty. Goutama in Mālavikāgnimitram dominates the whole play as well as all other characters including the King Agnimitra who, as Goutama thinks, like a poor patient looks anxiously for the physician who will himself bring medicine for him. The allegorical meaning of this argument of Goutama regarding the King is that the King surrenders absolutely before the towering personality of his Vidūṣaka and expects that his clever Vidūṣaka will do everything for him to get hold of Mālavikā and Goutama quite expectedly makes plan after plan to fulfill the secret desire of the King tearing and smashing the importance and dominance of all other actors of the play including the King himself. So this play has become absolutely Vidūṣaka oriented. The whole audience remain busy to watch the jugglery of the Vidūṣaka having no appeal of the art and performance of the rest characters in their heart and mind and as they leave the auditorium they recollect and ruminate the skill and performance of the Vidūṣaka only. This is not the appropriate symptom of an ideal drama. In an ideal drama every character should get their due, fair and legitimate scope to develop in their own ways and in a drama like Mālavikāgnimitram where the hero himself becomes cipher, it seems that the drama becomes a victim of injustice at the hand of the dramatist himself. However, Goutama is a superb

blend of a buffoon as well as of a highly skillful actor. He controls and directs the course of the whole play like a skillful juggler who controls the puppets from behind with his invisible strings. He is everything of the play. In fact Mālavikāgnimitram with Goutama is a compact play but Mālavikāgnimitram without Goutama is like the dry shell of a wood-apple without its kernel.

As soon as Goutama hears that Agnimitra is interested in Mālavikā and is very much anxious to win her, he in no time starts weaving the cob-web of his master plan, arranges fake dance-competition, coaxes Bakulāvalikā to be a party of his plan, manages to secure possession of Queen Dhāriṇī's ring that bears a serpent-seal for releasing Mālavikā and Bakulāvalikā from the prison and ultimately through some pros and cons becomes successful to unite Agnimitra and Mālavikā. Throughout the play he maintains a strong self-confidence. No other character in Sanskrit literature excepting Cāṇakya could show such self-confidence like Goutama.

But this dominance of Vidūṣaka which we find in Goutama diminishes in Vikramorbaśīyam and Abhijñānaśakuntalam. The role of Māṇavaka and Māḍhavya can not influence, control or direct the course of action of the play. Unlike Goutama they have no direct contribution in the fulfillment of the heroes' love affairs. The personality of the King Agnimitra becomes pale owing to the existence of Goutama. But Māṇavaka and Māḍhavya act under the dominance of the heroes. Although Goutama is a Vidūṣaka, the

most striking factor of his character is his extraordinary intellect. But Māṇavaka is a fool and is prone to commit blunders. The King himself admonishes him for his obliviousness. But we experience a different taste in the character of Māḍhavya. While Goutama strides on hard realities remaining busy in making plan after plan to reach his goal, Māḍhavya is a man who roams above all the complexities of day to day life and spends his total energy to serve pellucid humour on the stage and give his warm company to the King as and when required in the interest of dramatic sequence. He never crosses his limit. It seems to us that his presence in the play is just like a moonlit night when everything of this earth is seen excepting its ugliness. He plays a modest role with his soothing personality and dignified behavior. No maid-servant or other inferior person indulges in frivolous talks with him. He has been successful to establish a hearty and candid image of his character in the play. He never resorts to any type of cunningness or guiles like Goutama. His character diffuses a pleasant light of his soothing personality and innocent humour. His humour bears no sarcasm but it is everywhere moderate, enjoyable, witty and pleasant. Although Goutama is successful as a perfect Vidūṣaka in all sense, he can not deny the presence of some degraded qualities in his character e.g. cunningness, beguilement, false play etc. Although we are amused and amazed to see his superb ingenuity, the manner in which he arranges the fake dance competition taking Parivrājikā into his confidence, coaxes Bakulāvalikā to side with him, captures Queen Dhāriṇī's ring that bears a serpent-seal,

releases Mālavikā and Bakulāvalikā from prison cajoling the prison-guard with his false information emit bad smell of dishonesty of his character. To fulfill his purpose he does not care for morality a little. He feels no hesitation or shame to declare his defects eloquently. When Iravatī terms Gautama satirisingly as 'minister of kāmatantra' and accuses him for his crooked diplomatic policy, he in no time says, "If I knew the diplomatic policy a little I would forget Gāyatrī.[115]" A cunning person whatever applause he may get from others, also deserves hatred and malice of some section against him. Goutama although establishes himself as a Karmasaciva par excellence of Agnimitra, becomes an object of malice and hatred of Irāvatī and her maid-servant Nipuṇikā who reviles him for his cunningness and beguilement.

But unlike Goutama, Māḍhavya deserves no malice, no hatred, no anger from others. He is modest in behaviour, honest in his activity, pleasant in his character, loyal in his relation with the King and laughable in nature. But Māṇavaka is something different. He has neither the sharpness of intelligence of Goutama nor bears the emollient essence of soothing personality of Māḍhavya. He appears as a Vidūṣaka possessing the general qualifications prescribed by Alaṁkāraśāstra.

If we proceed to mention the basic characteristic of the three Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa in a word we will see that Goutama is shrewd, Māṇavaka is simpleton and Māḍhavya is

115. भोदि, जदि णीदीए एक्कं वि अक्खरं पढेअं ण मए अत्तभव संस्मिदो हवे I Act-IV

simple and honest. Unlike Māṇavaka and Māḍhavya, Goutama is terribly dominant and authoritative on the stage that raises the legitimate question as to who between him and Agnimitra the real hero of the play is. On the other hand Māṇavaka and Māḍhavya are restrained and docile. This broad difference between Goutama on the one hand and Māṇavaka and Māḍhavya on the other hand is not a matter to be overlooked so simply. Herein lies an important clue of the course of evolution of the dramatic genius of the great poet Kālidāsa. We do not know exactly at what age he started his literary career and at what age he left for heavenly abode. But taking his whole literary contribution into consideration, we may divide his whole literary career in three stages viz. first stage i.e. his early life when he had more emotion and comparatively less intellect, second stage where there was expectedly some balance of emotion and intellect and third i.e. the final stage where there was more intellect and comparatively less emotion. As Mālavikāgnimitram is his first creation, it was surely written in the first stage of his career. As it is quite normal Kālidāsa's genius might not have attained adequate maturity at this stage and quite naturally some deficits crawled into his writings and he happened to commit some technical mistake of giving too much indulgence and importance to his Vidūṣaka of this play i.e. Goutama who devoured the total importance of all other characters including that of the hero. But as Kālidāsa reached the second stage of his literary career, his maturity as a poet and a playwright developed more and gradually he could understand his shortcomings and so he

started to rein the dominance of his Vidūṣakas in his subsequent plays. So we see that in Vikramorbaśīyam the dominance of the Vidūṣaka is curtailed. Although in this play Māṇavaka has some role in the development of the plot, he can not control or influence the same like Goutama. And when Kālidāsa treading some more path reached the third stage of his literary career, he created Abhijñānaśakuntalam -- the bliss of his heart's paradise. Here the Vidūṣaka got a specific role i.e. the role of a buffoon whose only function is to give comic relief to the highly serious sentiment. He has no role to control the course of the play or the activity of other characters. He has no relation with the central activity of the play. For this reason Kālidāsa withdraws him from the centre of the main activity of the play. In fact unlike Goutama his absence rather than presence helps much for future plot development. Had he been present in the Tapovana along with Duṣyanta and saw Śakuntalā, the play would not proceed in this manner. Had he been present in the venue when Śakuntalā came before Duṣyanta to remind him of his relation with her, the audience would witness a different ending of the play. So as we see in Mālavikāgnimitram that Goutama as a Vidūṣaka is vested with the duty of leading the play from beginning to end, Māḍhavya in Abhijñānaśakuntalam is exempted from that responsibility. So we see that the wonderful genius of Kālidāsa who started his journey as a playwright in respect of creating the character of Vidūṣaka from Goutama in Mālavikāgnimtram reached its culmination in the creation of Māḍhavya in Abhijñānaśakuntalam.

6. Comparison of the characters of the Vidūṣakas observed by Bhāsa and Kālidāsa.

Now let us have a comparative study of all the seven characters of Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa taking together. In this attempt we will see that all these Vidūṣakas have some similarities although in different degrees. They have some glaring dissimilarities too. All of them are Brahmins, all of them are gluttons. But whereas Santuṣṭa expresses voracious gluttony, others are to some extent restrained or polished in this regard. While the physical appearance of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa correspond to the prescription of Bharata, Bhāsa's Vidūṣakas differ from that. The names of some of the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa are given after the name of season in obedience to the prescriptions of ancient dramaturgies like Viśvanātha. But Kālidāsa did not obey this rule although there is a difference of opinion among the critics as to whether the meaning of the name Māḍhavya bears any analogy with the spring season. Let us proceed to explain in detail.

In Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa Vasantaka remarks before the Minister Yaugandharāyaṇa in absence of the King that the King has converted the prison into a pleasure house. In Abhijñānaśakuntalam Māḍhavya equally says that the King has converted the Tapovana into a pleasure garden. But their logic is totally different. Vasantaka says this out of his disgust against the love-affair of the King. But Māḍhavya tells this to the King affectionately being worried about the well-being of the King because Śakuntalā is an Āśramakanyā of Tapovana

which is a sacred place and the King's attempt to make love with a Ṛṣikanyā and to seduce her may be treated as a moral turpitude which may blemish the character of the King as well as of the innocent Āśramakanyā Śakuntalā and may vitiate the purity and sanctity of the Āśrama which is the abode of the ascetics and it may lead to a disastrous consequence for the King. Vasantaka's remark too reveals that he is not a confidant of the hero in love. Rather he opposes the King's love affair. But this is not applicable in the case of Māḍhavya. Firstly, he tells this to the King jestingly in a friendly manner, may be to relish the sweet taste of an innocent taunt whereas Vasantaka's remark is an unadulterated complaint against the love affair of the King. Besides, the statement of Māḍhavya reveals that he is well aware about the prevailing social values which we do not notice in the case of the Vidūṣaka of Bhāsa.

Both the Vidūṣakas of Vikramorbaśīyam and Abhijñānaśakuntalam i.e. Māṇavaka and Mādhavya respectively appear to be against the secret love affair of the Kings though Māḍhavya helped the King much in an indirect way in his secret love affair. So both of them may not appear to be a true confidant of the heroes. But there is a different between the two. Māṇavaka instead of remaining as a true and faithful assistant of the King takes sides with the Queen Aiśīnarī and vows to liberate the King from the infatuation of the Apsarā Urvaśī. From this one may come to the conclusion that he has no tangible reason for opposing the King's love-affair. He simply does this only to remain in the good book of the Queen Aiśīnarī. But it may not be proper to judge

Māṇavaka from so simple outlook. It will be discussed later on. However, unlike Māṇavaka Māḍhavya is always with the King but opposes the King's secret love with the sacred Āśramakanyā Śakuntalā only to desist his coeval King, as his well-wisher, from committing the probable offence of seducing the serenity and chastity of the sacred place of the ascetics. So Māḍhavya has a noble and elevated intention behind his seeming opposition against the love- affair of the King. In Vikramorbaśīyam, Māṇavaka too perhaps has some positive reasons behind his declared opposition against the King's mission of fulfilling his object of love. He may have thought that the consequence of making secret love with an Apsarā may not be auspicious for the King Purūravas. So behind his opposition against the king's love affair there was probably his well-wishing for the King. If Urvaśī were not an Apsarā and if she were a human being of flesh and blood Māṇavaka might not have any necessity to oppose the King's love affair.

Mode of talking, language etc. of Bhāsa's Vidūṣakas are of lesser qualities in comparison to those of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa. In fact the languages and art of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa in respect of serving fun and amusement on the stage are of far more higher quality. Their languages are more polished and bear literary and aesthetic value. Kālidāsa is more choosy in respect of selecting language for his Vidūṣakas. Of course there are reasons behind this. Bhāsa performed his literary activity in an age far ago than that of Kālidāsa. In the age of Bhāsa the society was very simple and did not see the

beam of modernization. The human civilization was more backward then as compared with that of Kālidāsa and these left reflections in the characters of his Vidūṣakas. There is no gainsaying the fact that the mental status of human being, their sense of values etc. have a definite relation with the progress of human civilization vis-à-vis its modernization. The more developed the human civilization is, the more the qualitative value of human brain and mind blooms and this invariably leaves its trace in literature. And exactly this happened in the case of Kālidāsa. The age of Kālidāsa was more sophisticated, more modern and the audience was also of more sophisticated taste and also the literary qualities of the litterateurs developed more. Hence higher qualities of characters including Vidūṣakas were born out the mind of Kālidāsa.

Both Santuṣṭa of Bhāsa and Māṇavaka of Kālidāsa are easily deceived by the ordinary cunning maid-servants. But the cause of their being deceived by them are of totally different nature. Santuṣṭa is deceived by the cunning maid-servant Nalinikā owing to his extreme greed for food. Although extreme fondness for food is the natural characteristic of the Vidūṣakas, the base manner in which Santuṣṭa is allured for food is disgraceful. Other Vidūṣakas are also more or less glutton but they look for food to some extent in dignified manner. It is quite natural that a man who loves to eat delicious food will look for it whenever he feels it necessary. There is nothing disgraceful in it. But if he, like Santuṣṭa, expresses his greediness for food in a base and shameful manner that is

tantamount to disgracefulness. Although Santuṣṭa's madness for getting food from Nalinikā at any cost generates profuse fun for the audience, it is transient. The audience does not find any credit of Santuṣṭa behind this funny situation. Rather the credit goes to Nalinikā who successfully induces him to make himself a subject of ridicule which the audience enjoys. A true literature is that in which a reader or audience finds his inner self. Here the audience can not see his own reflection in Santuṣṭa because very rare persons will allow himself to be cheated by some inferior person like maid-servant for his extreme greediness for food.

Māṇavaka also is easily cheated by the maid-servant Nipuṇikā but that is due to some psychological reasons which may happen in the life of any person irrespective of their age, status, education, culture, nationality etc. It is quite natural that when someone bears some forbidden secret in his mind, he becomes pray of some indescribable restlessness within himself. And it is the normal propensity of human being that if at this stage he faces slightest temptation all on a sudden, he, on the spur of the moment, happens to disclose the said secret unconsciously. His human psychology makes him helpless in this field. Exactly this happens in the case of Māṇavaka when he says to Nipuṇikā, "Has the King called the Queen Aiśīnarī as Urvaśī"? Seeing this episode of Māṇavaka the audience at large shall think that something like this happened in his life once or may happen in future. This is the characteristics of ideal literature which tells about the secret thoughts and feelings of human mind. So Kālidāsa is amply successful as a

litterateur here because he is able to highlight the universal psychology of human being through Māṇavaka. So though these episodes of Santuṣṭa and Māṇavaka basically indicate their stupidity, they can not be weighed in the same scale. In the case of Santuṣṭa it is his mere stupidity, but in the case of Māṇavaka it is his psychological mistake .

One important and striking feature of the character of Vidūṣaka is that his role does not remain limited as a buffoon or fun maker only. He is also to act as a court jester because sometimes the hero is a king. In Bhāsa's Vidūṣakas we do not find them in this shape. But in Kālidāsa's Vidūṣaka we notice a fleeting touch of this characteristic in their character. Thus in Act-II of Abhijñānaśakuntalam we see Māḍhavya to come out of the membrane of mere Vidūṣaka and to cut jokes at the game-monger Senāpati. In Mālavikāgnimitram also we see Goutama to arrange fake dance competition and to induce the two dance masters Gaṇadāsa and Haradutta to involve in a quarrel between them and make fun of it. In this way they play the role of court jester.

The Vidūṣakas of both Bhāsa and Kālidāsa have a common snake-phobia. But it is to be seen how far the said phobia is reasonable and expected from at least a man of average prudence, how far that delusion of taking an inanimate thing for a snake evokes fun and humour. In Svapnavāsavadattam Vasantaka sees a garland lying on the floor of Samudragṛha and mistakes it for a snake and instantly becomes highly frightened. This episode may indicate cowardice on the part of Vasantaka but this is not a source of

profuse fun for the audience. Very rarely a man will commit this type of mistake. Vasantaka sees the garland and mistakes it for a snake. At this moment the body language of the Vidūṣaka can not be such as to rouse profuse fun. If the Vidūṣaka does so, it will be exaggeration of acting and hypocrisy. But in case of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa, the snake-phobia is the outcome of pure psychological effect. In case of Māṇavaka and Goutama something like a snake falls on their body. In the pleasure garden Māṇavaka is deeply engrossed in serious discussion with the King Purūravas about the king's love affair with the Apsarā Urvaśī . Just then when Māṇavaka's mind is fully preoccupied with the thought of the King's love affair, the birch-leaf letter of Urvaśī falls on him all on a sudden and Māṇavaka springs up in utter fear mistaking it to be something like the slough of a snake. It is quite expected that an absent-minded man is most likely to startle unconsciously like Māṇavaka if this type of situation occurs. So quite naturally the physical reaction of scared Māṇavaka at this event is sure to cause natural outburst of laughter for the audience. More humorous is the situation in the case of Goutama. Feeling completely relaxed and unworried Goutama is dozing off sitting at the gate of Samudragṛha and is talking within himself in his slumber against Irāvatī and in favour of Mālavikā. At this moment the wicked Ceṭī Nipuṇikā throws the crooked stick on him with a view to frightening him. Quite naturally Goutama springs up in utter fear as a consequence of abruptness of incidence and thinks that some snake has fallen on his body. One can easily imagine how humorous the body language and

posture of Goutama can be at this moment. It is likely that while waking up from his immature doze he makes some peculiar jocose sounds from his mouth also. The audience of whatever class or standard or age they may be is sure to convulse with loud laughter watching this highly comical scene. So there is no artificiality in the said snake phobia of Māṇavaka and Goutama. It is purely a psychological reaction. From psychological point of view any man can behave like Goutama if he becomes prey of similar situation which we can not say about Vasantaka. So the humour of Kālidāsa bears a natural flavour and has an universal appeal than that of Bhāsa.

The psychological standard of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa is more mature than that of the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa. In Act V Avimāraka meets Kuraṅgī in the palace and indulges in amorous discussion with her. The dunce Vidūṣaka fails to comprehend that the hero Avimāraka needs some scope to talk with Kuraṅgī in private. So he continues idle chatting. But even the inferior Ceṭī Nalinikā understands this and drags Santuṣṭa to leave this place to give scope to Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī to enjoy the presence of each other in private. Santuṣṭa is so dunce that he can not understand her real motif and shouts for his release from her hand.

But quite opposite we find in the case of Goutama. When in Act IV Agnimitra meets Mālavikā in the Samudragṛha and the King carries on amorous talks with her, the intelligent Goutama quickly understands that now they should be left alone so that they can enjoy their company properly in private. So he drags Bakulāvalikā, the friend of Mālavikā outside on the

plea of chasing out a fawn which is eating the sprouts of Aśoka plant. So we see that the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa have much more psychological maturity than those of Bhāsa.

The Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa excel the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa in their capacity of love for nature, using simile and metaphor and using language for describing a matter. In Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa Vasantaka compares the smell of his stomach to the smell of the wind passing through the urinary bladder of a swine. What a rubbish simile and what an uncivil language this is! But Māṇavaka in Vikramorbaśīyam compares the angry Queen to the swollen river of rainy season. What a superb simile! The impression of superb quality of his love for Nature, power of imagination and melodious description of natural phenomenon through dulcet language which he left in the second Act while describing the Maṇiśilāpaṭṭaka is highly adorable.[116] Goutama gives proof of his high skill of using beautiful language for using simile when he compares the angry queen Irāvatī to the red planet Mars. In fact the similes used by the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa are more appropriate, significant and proficient from literary point of view than those used by the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa. Comparing Mālavikā under the captivity of queen Dhāriṇī to a pigeon caught by a cat, comparing the king Agnimitra fretting always in amorous greed for Mālavikā to a greedy carnivorous bird hovering over a butcher's shop are some of the beautiful similes used by Goutama. But sometimes we notice similarity in the tune of

116. एसो मणिसिलापट्टसणाहो अहिमुत्तलदामंडवो भमरसंघट्टपडिदेहिं कुसुमेहि सअं विअ किदोवआरो भवंतं पडिच्छदि I (Manisila pattakam) Act—II

using similes used by the Vidūṣakas of both Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. In Avimāraka Santuṣṭa compares the white palace in the light of the setting Sun to pale ball of curds and the Sun to mixture of molasses and honey. Similarly Māṇavaka in Vikramorbaśīyam compares the rising moon to a piece of broken sweetmeat.

The Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa differ much in their attitude towards the maid-servants as well as their relation and treatment with them. The language in which they abuse the maid-servants differs from each other. While Bhāsa's Vidūṣakas use the terms as 'kumbhadāsī', 'adharmadāsī', 'grabhbhedadāsī' etc. which are quite uncommon and meaningful expressions of abuse, Kālidāsa's Vidūṣakas use the terms like 'garbhadāsī', 'dāsyasuta', 'dāsyaputrī' etc. which are common abusive expressions and are much more coarse and harsh than those used by the Vidūṣaks of Bhāsa. These terms are more disgraceful for a woman's character. 'Kumbhadāsī' means a maid by birth and 'adharmadāsī' means an illegal maid. But 'garbhadāsī 'dāsyasuta', 'dāsyaputrī' bear the meaning that the maid is an illegitimate child and indicate that the maid's mother has an immoral relation with his master.

It is worth noting that although Bhāsa's Vidūṣakas use the abusive terms for the maids they have cordial relation with them. This we amply find in Avimāraka when Nalinikā tells Santuṣṭa that by taking her ornaments he has become her husband. But the maid-servants of Kālidāsa's plays do not dare indulging in such type of frivolous talks with the Vidūṣakas who

maintain no such cordial relation with the maid-servants. We see that Bhāsa's Vidūṣakas in spite of being a close associate of the hero are simultaneously fellows of the society of the maids but the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa although they have interactions with the maid-servants remain the members of the royal atmosphere in heart and soul. In fact while the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa e.g. Santuṣṭa fall easy prey to the cunningness of the maid-servants, lose their personalities before the shrewdness of the maid-servants and ultimately interweave themselves with the society of the maid-servants whom they revile, the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa maintain their positional distance from them in tactful manner. In other words it may be said here that while the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa like Goutama utilized the maid-servants as tools to serve their purposes, the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa like Santuṣṭa completely lost themselves in them. The Vidūṣakas whatever degraded life they may lead, are close associates of the hero and sometimes an important member of the royal court. So they must enjoy some privilege in the royal court and it is fairly expected that the ordinary workmen must have some sense of reverence for them and must not have courage to make fun of them freely. This we find in the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa. It is true that Māṇavaka is easily cheated by the Ceṭī Nipuṇikā but the episode ends there. She does never venture to frolic with him. In Mālavikāgnimitram too the Ceṭī Nipuṇikā teases Goutama dropping a crooked stick on him but it is done by her when Goutama dozes and that too she does this in an indirect manner solely on the strength of Queen Irāvatī. But Nalinikā teases Santuṣṭa directly. Moreover

Santuṣṭa's position reached almost to the stage of ragging at the hand of Nalinikā. This indicates that the personality and position of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa are higher than those of the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa in the eyes of all concerned.

It is important to note here that Maitreya, the Vidūṣaka of Cārudattam is something different in respect of revealing the abusiveness of his character towards ladies i.e. maid-servants unlike most other Vidūṣakas. He bears a faint similarity with Māḍhavya in this regard. Of course Māḍhavya unlike Maitreya has no such tangible situation to come in close contact with the maid-servants nor he has any necessity to use or exploit the services of the maid-servants to fulfill his purpose. However, while we see that using abusive terms for the maid-servants is a very easy and spontaneous matter for the Vidūṣakas like Santuṣṭa and Goutama, Maitreya maintains praiseworthy decorum in this regard. He never uses any abusive language towards the maid-servants. On the contrary he behaves with them with proper courtesy. He addresses them with the words 'Bhodi' that means 'respected lady'. He is conscious about the dignity and honour of women. This is why he affectionately requests Radanikā not to disclose to others the fact of her disgrace at the hand of Śakāra because that will increase her disgrace and mental agony. Here he takes off the cloak of a conventional Vidūṣaka and acts like a soft-hearted magnanimous person whose heart aches at the sight of humiliation and disgrace of women.

Kālidāsa's Vidūṣakas are not stereotype and monotonous. Although they are drawn in conventional

manner, they are not mere wooden puppets in the hand of the dramatist who pulls the strings from behind. They have vivacity, freshness and distinction. They have diversity and ingenuity in their activities. As for example Goutama is at the same time glutton, fun maker, a true confidant of the king in love and possesses extraordinary capacity of weaving the thread of plot.

The prescription of Bharata regarding the appearance of the Vidūṣaka has not been obeyed by Bhāsa at all while in the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa we find frequent references of their physical deformity and ugliness. In Vikramorbaśīyam Māṇavaka while going to express his inquisitiveness about the beauty of Urvaśī describes himself as the ugliest person. In Act II of Abhijñānaśakuntalam Māḍhavya stands on the stage leaning on his crooked stick making his body as crooked as his crooked stick. Bharata also prescribed that the Vidūṣaka should have a monkey-like shape which is also a physical deformity. In Bhāsa's plays we never find such a Vidūṣaka having a monkey-like shape. But in Kālidāsa we find reflection of this dictum. In Vikramorbaśīyam the maid-servant Nipuṇikā describes Māṇavaka as a tawny monkey drawn in a picture. In the fifth Act of the same play Māṇavaka compares himself to a monkey while attempting to dispel fear from the mind of Prince Āyus. In Mālavikāgnimtram Goutama calls the tawny monkey that frightened the Princes as his 'Svapakṣa'

Bhāsa perhaps would think that physical deformity of person can not be the source of fun. Rather it evokes sympathy for the deformed person. So perhaps for this reason he did not

follow the prescription of Bharata in this regard. But Kālidāsa perhaps was of the opinion that temporary use of deformity of body and ugliness of appearance of Vidūṣaka on the stage causes profuse fun and it is really so. It is for this reason that he portrayed the figure of the Vidūṣaka not as a genetically deformed or ugly person but resorted to this characteristic as a temporary measure. It is true that a man having sound conscience must feel pity and sympathy for a man having a deformed body and ugly appearance. But if a man of normal physique imitates the deformity and ugliness of a person by his pose, posture and physical expression, that produces profuse laughter. Kālidāsa knew this very well and so he resorted to this temporary measure. In fact Kālidāsa perceived human nature and psychology better than Bhāsa and this he reflected in his Vidūṣakas.

7. Evaluation

A comparative study of the characters of the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa reveals a good number of points of their characters which have some distinct similarities and dissimilarities although they are basically provided in the dramas for producing fun for the audience. However, I want to conclude this paper of mine referring to some particular aspect of the character of the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa. We have discussed earlier that the Vidūṣakas of Kālidāsa surpass the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa in their capacity of using language, describing a thing, using simile and metaphor etc. But here mention may be made of a fact that perhaps one rare quality of the character of Goutama remains unnoticed till now and that is the poetic aptitude of his character. As we go through Act-II, Act-III and Act-V of Mālavikāgnimitram we get fleeting touches of this rare quality of his character. In Act-II Agnimitra becomes impatient highly to get Mālavikā. But it is extremely difficult to catch sight of her because she is in the tight custody of queen Dhāriṇī. Goutama describes this situation in such a beautiful language that anyone who happens to pay a slight attention to the statement of Goutama where he compares Mālavikā under the tight custody of queen Dhāriṇī to the bright moonlight overcast by dark clouds smells an essence of poetry in it. Again in Act-III when the king is entering into the pleasure garden, it is spring season and the delicate and succulent twigs of the verdant trees and creepers of the garden are oscillating by the

affectionate touch of the gentle breeze. At once Goutama's dormant poetic spirit becomes active in the canvas of his mind and with the retina of his poetic eyes he beholds as if the said gentle twigs are delicate fingers of the trees which are welcoming the king waving those fingers. In Act- V when in the pleasure garden he sees the blossoming boughs of the youthful Aśoka plant, it seems in his imaginative eyes that the youthful Aśoka plant is clad in a beautiful dress. There is every doubt whether there can be more beautiful similes than these for describing these situations. We can not expect this quality from the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa. Herein lies the specialty of Kālidāsa. His Vidūṣakas are not mere machines to produce fun and caricature only. They have introspection and some distinct philosophy of life which we do not notice in the Vidūṣakas of Bhāsa.

Bibliography

1. Ācārya, Sitānāth and Dās, Debkumār, Dasarūpaka, Edt. Sanskrit Pustak Bhāndār, 1st Edition, 1997.
2. Bandyopādhāya,Dhirendrnāth, Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa, Edt. Navapatra Prakāśanī, 2nd Edition,2011.
3. Basu, Anil Chandra Abhijñānaśakuntalam- 4th Edition, 2003, Sanskrit Book Depot, Calcutta.
4. Bhāt, Govinda Kesava, The Vidūṣaka- The New Order Book House, Ahmedabad, 1959.
5. Bose, Rāmendra Mohan, Abhijñānaśakuntalam, Fourth Edition,1963,
6. Ghosh, Manomohan, The Nāṭyaśāstram- Edt. Asiatic Society.
7. Jha, Balgovinda, Svapnavāsavdattam- Chaukhāmbā Sanskrit Sansthan.
8. Kale, M. R. Abhijñānaśakuntalam- Edt. Mumbai, 1903.
9. Kāñjilāl, Sri Dilip Kumār, Saṁskṛta Sāhitye Hāsyarasa, Sanskrit College, 1964.
10. Keith, A. B. The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice,
11. Mālaviya, Sudhākar, Abhijñānaśakuntalam- Chaukhāmbā Sanskrit Sansthan.
12. Misra, Gopālchandra, Different Attitudes of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa in respect of Treatment of Vidūṣaka. Corpos of indoligical studies. Professor Ramāranjan Mukherjee Felicitation Volume II, Sāradā Publishing House, Delhi.
13. Mishra, Pandit Bindheswariprasād, Vikramorbaśīyam-

Chaukhāmbā Sanskrit Sansthān.

14. Mishra, Sri Rāmachandra, Mālavikāgnimitram-The Haridās Sanskrit Granthamālā, 216, The Choukhāmbā Sanskrit Series Office, 1988.

15. Parikh, J. T. Sanskrit Comic Characters, Surāt, 1952.

16. Parikh, J. T. The Vidūṣaka-Theory and Practice, Sārvajanik Education Society, Surāt, 1953.

17. Rāghavan, V. The Comic Elements in Sanskrit Literature, Saṁskrita Raṅga,1989.

18. Rai, Gangāsāgar, Cārudattam- The Kāshi Sanskrit Series-289, Second Edition: 2005, Chaukhāmbā Sanskrit Sansthān.

19. Rāi, Gangasāgar, Avimārakam- The Kāśī Sanskrit Series-248, First Edition: 1989, Chaukhāmbā Sanskrit Sansthān.

20. Rāo, U. Venkatakrishna, Bhāsa's Vidūṣakas- Poonā Orientalist XVIII, January to October, 1953.

21. Verma, Gāyatri, Humour in Kālidāsa- Publisher, Atmā Rām & Sons Delhi, 1981.